MARYLAND DIOCESAN
LIBRARY

St. Mark's Library
THE
General Theological
Seminary

Chelsea Square · New York

Maryland Diocesan Library
The Memorial Library
of the Reverend Edwin A. Dalrymple.
Whittingham Collection

FOUR DISCOURSES

ON THE

SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD

OF

JESUS CHRIST;

AND ON

ATONEMENT AND REDEMPTION.

BY

JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D.

O unexampled love!
Love no where to be found less than divine.
Hail, Son of God, Saviour of men! Thy name
Shall be the copious matter of my song
Henceforth; and never shall my harp thy praise
Forget, nor from thy Father's praise disjoin.

MILTON.

LONDON:

B. J. HOLDSWORTH,

18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD.

M.DCCC.XXVIII.

234.2
Sm 61

191276

LONDON:
PRINTED BY S. HOLDSWORTH, 13, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MARYLAND DIOCESAN
LIBRARY

TO THE REVEREND

STEVENSON MACGILL, D. D.

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW,

DEAR SIR,

As it was your kind opinion and recommendation which had a principal share in leading to the publication of this volume, I am gratified by the opportunity which it affords of testifying my veneration for your character, and my cordial wishes and prayers for the long continuance of your personal happiness, and of your extensive usefulness in the defence and diffusion of sacred truth.

I have the honour to be

Your obedient and attached servant,

J. PYE SMITH.

Homerton,
February 22, 1828.

PREFACE.

The first of the following Discourses was delivered as a Sermon, at a Monthly Lecture of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, in the year 1813; and was published at the request of my brethren in the ministry who had heard it, and who were pleased to express the hope that it might be of some use in the confirmation of a great branch of Christian truth. It is now republished, in compliance with repeated requests from valued friends in England and Scotland. In revising the Discourse with this view, I could not satisfy myself to lay before the public a mere reprint. Many thoughts appeared to admit of being more fully developed, or pursued to further consequences. These objects I have attempted to accomplish, partly by interspersed additions, but principally in the Three Discourses now annexed to the former one.

A discussion of the Sacrifice of our Blessed Redeemer could not but include some reference to his office and action as a PRIEST, "when he offered up himself." Such reference had been already made, in the original form of the First Discourse. To give the subject that further scope which would be suitable to its greatness, and especially to present a view of the rich contents of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in relation to this glorious theme, clearly demanded a separate Discourse.

SACRIFICE, in its most general idea, is a provision of the Divine Wisdom, in order that the manner of conferring mercy may make the deepest impression of the evil of sin and the guilt of the transgressor. Hence it cannot be even superficially studied, without involving an attention to the nature, reasons, and moral operation of a compensative arrangement, by which the restoration of the sinner may be effected without detriment to the public righteousness of the Most High.

ATONEMENT, therefore, or RECONCILIATION, or SATISFACTION, is a provision for guarding the

laws of eternal wisdom; so that the goodness of the Divine Government may sustain no disparagement, in receiving transgressors to favour, and in conferring upon them the richest benefits of benevolence.

Redemption is the effect of Atonement, as it is brought to bear upon the moral and relative state of the sinner.

To place these momentous subjects in a clear point of view, to show their solid foundations in the nature of things and the revealed authority of God, to preclude objections by anticipating their grounds, and to render the convictions of the understanding effectual as lessons to the heart; have been my desire and aim. May the Spirit of grace vouchsafe to grant his blessing!

It is an unwelcome necessity which, at any time, leads to a departure from the exact words of our authorized translation, in making citations from the Bible: but such a necessity, I have conceived, lay upon me; first, in order to place the English reader, as much as possible, in a

capacity of forming his own judgment, equal to that which those enjoy who can consult the original texts; and secondly, because it appeared to be a duty to produce the testimonies of the sacred word in what I conscientiously believe to be their native meaning and unaltered force, as nearly as the idioms of different languages and remote times will permit. The reasons for deviating from the established translation will usually shew themselves to the scholar. In those instances where they might not be obvious, they are accounted for in the Notes. As the object was to convey, in the most brief and direct manner, that which appears to me *the genuine meaning*, it has been sometimes necessary to use turns of expression a little paraphrastic; and occasionally to insert supplementary words. Such supplements every person, who is accustomed to translating, perfectly knows to be unavoidable, for transfusing into one language the true sense of terms and phrases in another.*

* "The expediency grows every day more and more evident, of setting forth the Holy Scriptures, for public use, to better advantage than as they appear in the present English translation. As to the style and language, it admits but of little

improvement: but, in respect of the *sense* and the *accuracy of interpretation*, the improvements of which it is capable, are *great* and *numberless*." *Bishop* LOWTH'S *Isaiah; Prelim. Diss.* p. 72.

☞ It has been suggested that the reference in p. 85, to Mr. Leo's translation, printed at Cambridge, of a part of Dr. Gesenius's Hebrew Lexicon, is not perfectly intelligible to those who have not that translation at hand. I am therefore obliged to add, that the article in question appears in Mr. Leo's splendid volume, very defectively; either from having suffered abridgment, or from being derived from Gesenius's first edition in 1815: but the passage, as cited in this volume, is taken from the author's *second* and *much improved* edition; *Leipzig*, 1823.

*** *Addition to page* 160. While the last sheets of this book are in printing, I have received, by the kindness of my much esteemed friend, the Rev. MATTHIAS BRUEN of New York, the first volume of a most important publication from the Andover Theological Seminary, "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews," by the learned and judicious Professor MOSES STUART, (see p. 240,) to whom and his colleagues the Christian public is already indebted for eminently valuable contributions to Biblical and Theological Literature. This first volume is occupied entirely with the Critical History of the Epistle. The author has fully investigated the subject, and has entered into a detailed statement and examination of the objections which have been brought by the Neological and other writers of Germany. I have time to insert only two or

three sentences, from Mr. STUART's "balancing of the *testimony* thus collected and compared," and from his "result" of the *internal* evidence.

"The *early* testimony is, of course, immeasurably the most important. And there seems to me sufficient evidence, that this was as general and as uniform, for the first century after the apostolic age, as in respect to many other books of the New Testament; and more so than in respect to several. I cannot hesitate to believe, that THE WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE FROM TRADITION, IS ALTOGETHER PREPONDERANT IN FAVOUR OF THE OPINION, THAT PAUL WAS THE AUTHOR OF OUR EPISTLE." P. 131.

"The historical evidence against the Pauline origin of our Epistle is, as we have seen, so little, so vague, and for the most part so indirect, that we may well say, 'The objections have never been of an *historical* nature, but of a *conjectural* one.' They have arisen more from taste and feeling, than from tradition or testimony." P. 270.

"On the whole, I must acquiesce in the opinion of ORIGEN, which I repeat as the general voice of antiquity: 'IT IS NOT WITHOUT REASON THE ANCIENTS HAVE HANDED IT DOWN TO US, THAT THIS EPISTLE IS PAUL'S." P. 271.

CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

PART I. ON THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

PAGE.

I. General Nature of Sacrifices 3

II. That the Ancient Rite of Sacrifice was a Symbolical Action 8

i. That Sacrifices had a designed Significancy 9

ii. The Sentiments signified by them 14

III. Application of the preceding Reasonings to the Sacrifice of CHRIST 20

i. That the Ancient Sacrifices were intended to represent the Great Work for which the Messiah was expected ..... *ib.*

1. Proofs from the Jewish Scriptures ..... *ib.*

2. Proofs from the New Testament 32

3. Argument from the Cessation of the Levitical Sacrifices 35

ii. That the Objects, of which the Ancient Sacrifices were only declarative, were really effected by the Sacrifice of Christ ..... *ib.*

PAGE.

1. Manifestation of important truths respecting the Perfections and Government of God 35
2. That Jesus Christ sustained the Punishment of Sin 39
3. The Sacrifice of Christ considered as a Satisfaction to the public Honour of the Divine Government 49

PART II. ON THE PROPER VALUE OF THE REDEEMER'S SACRIFICE.

I. The Person offering the Sacrifice in the capacity of Priest 60
II. The Subject of the Sacrifice 65
III. The Circumstance which confers its proper Value on this Great Sacrifice 67

PART III. ON THE EFFICACY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

I. Removal of Obstructions to the Legal and Honourable Exercise of Divine Mercy 71
II. Foundation of the Overtures of Reconciliation in the Gospel 73
III. Assurance of the Holiness and Happiness of all who cordially acquiesce in this Method of Grace 77

DISCOURSE II.

ON THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

1. Appellations of Jesus Christ, relating to this Office. 83
Priest.—Great Priest.—High Priest.—Mes-

PAGE.

senger.—Minister of the Sanctuary.—The Lord.—The Sanctifier.—Brother.—Surety.—Mediator.—Author.—Saviour.—Intercessor.—Forerunner.—Shepherd.—Son of God.—Accumulation of Terms of Dignity.

II. Characteristic Properties of this Office 130
Sole.—Perfect.—Matured by Death.—Ever valid.—Productive of the most glorious effects.

Recapitulation 156

Observations. i. On the Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews 159

ii. On the Error of regarding our Lord's Priesthood as figurative 161

iii. On the falsely called Rationalist System of Bible-Interpretation 163

DISCOURSE III.

ON THE ATONEMENT MADE BY CHRIST.

The Divine Moral Government 175
The Spirit of the Moral Law 176
Its Ground and Reason 180
Nature and Distributions of Holiness 183
Nature and State of Sin ..... *ib.*
The Essential Principle of Happiness 185
Happiness destroyed by Sin 186
Obligations to Obedience 189
Disobedience; its relation to the Deity 190
Effects of violated Obligation 192
The Justice of the Divine Government 193
Punishment, Natural and Positive 194

PAGE.
Depravity and Guilt of the Human Race 197
The conceivable Results of the Moral Condition of Man 198
A Compensative and Mediatorial System 201

DISCOURSE IV.

ON THE REDEMPTION EFFECTED BY CHRIST.

The Language of Scripture, analogical 203
Meaning of Terms 204
Equity, the fundamental Idea of all the analogies 208
Twofold obligation of a sinful Creature 212
Subjugation to the Tyranny of Depraved Angels 213
Propriety of the Metaphors derived from cancelling a Debt and paying a Ransom 217

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

I. Human Sacrifices 219
II. Socinian Views of the Sacrifice of Christ .. 220
III. Origin of Sacrifices 221
IV. Skins of Animals, immediately after the fall, converted into Clothing 232
V. Heathen Notions of the Intention of Sacrifices 234
VI. Doctrine of the Pythagoræans and Platonists 237
VII. Religious Instruction by the Levites 238
Winer's Description of the Levitical Sacrifices 239
VIII. The Crowned Priest and King, in Zechariah 257

PAGE.

IX. Objections of *Gesenius* to the Christian Interpretation of Isaiah liii.; and Replies to them 261

Addition to a Note in p. 28, on Isaiah liii. 12. 271

X. Four Translations of Isaiah liii. placed in parallel columns 273

XI. The Philosophy of Causation, favourable to the Christian Doctrine of Redemption .. 282

XII. On the term *Guilt*, in imputation to Christ .. 283

XIII. Evasion of Scriptural Language on the Sufferings of Christ 285

XIV. On the term *Satisfaction* 287

XV. On the term SAVIOUR 289

XVI. On the Socinian Assertion, that Christ had to offer for himself 291

XVII. On the words ETERNAL SPIRIT 295

XVIII. On the reading and interpretation of 1 Tim. iii. 16. .... *ib.*

XIX. On the Doctrine of the Deity of Christ 296

XX. Sketch of the Coincidences and Differences between Archbishop *Magee's* Work on Atonement and Sacrifice, and the First of these Discourses 298

XXI. On the Connexion of the Ideas of Ransom and Atonement 301

" When the measure of our iniquities was filled up, and it was perfectly manifest that now the retribution, even punishment and death, was alone to be expected; the time came which God had predetermined, for the manifestation of the goodness and power so surpassingly his own: so that his sole love, from a kindness to man exceeding all thought, [has wrought this work of grace.] He has not branded you with his hatred, nor cast you off, nor remembered your wickedness; but in his long-suffering and forbearance he has said, 'he bare our sins.' Himself hath given his own Son, a ransom-price for us, the Holy One for the transgressors, the Innocent for the wicked, the Righteous for the unrighteous, the Immortal for the mortal. For what, but his righteousness, could cover our sins? In whom was it possible that we, transgressors and ungodly, could be justified, but in the Son of God alone? O delightful substitution! O unsearchable work! O beneficence beyond all expectation! That the iniquity of the many should be lost in the Righteous One, and the righteousness of the One should justify the many transgressors! Thus, then, in the time past, God hath demonstrated the impossibility that our nature should, [by its own powers] obtain life; and now he hath displayed the Saviour, who is able to save, contrary to [all human] possibility. In both he hath declared his will, that we should trust in his goodness; and account Him our Nourisher, our Father, our Teacher, our Counsellor, our Healer, our Understanding, our Light, our Honour, our Glory, our Strength, our Life."

From the Epistle to *Diognetus*, in the works of *Justin Martyr*, ed. Paris, 1636, p. 500. Lardner calls it " an excellent epistle." Tillemont attributes it to the first century. Prof. Olshausen of Königsberg, (in his *Hist. Eccl. Vet. Monum. Præcip.* Berlin, 1822.) says that the author must certainly have lived near the time of the apostles.

DISCOURSE I.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

HEB. ix. 14.

—THE BLOOD OF CHRIST, WHO THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT, OFFERED HIMSELF WITHOUT SPOT TO GOD.

IN immediate importance, and in relation to all the parts of the Christian system, there is no doctrine that has a higher claim upon attention than the SACRIFICE which the Scriptures attribute to our Blessed Redeemer. It is a principal and solid ground for the whole body of instruction and precept, admonition and consolation, to the erection of which, under the divine blessing, all the labours of the Gospel ministry are devoted. On this foundation safely rest our acceptance with the Judge of all, our gratitude and holy obedience, our dearest hopes, and our immortal expectations. How happy shall I be, if the condescending grace of God shall render the attempt to establish and enforce this interesting

subject, effectual to the confirmation in holiness and to the salvation of him that writes and of those who read: and then it will assuredly be to God's own eternal praise!

The text is a part of the argument which the sacred writer pursues to a large extent, in order to shew that the sacrifices and other ceremonies of the Israelitish law had no intrinsic value, nor any efficacy in themselves to redeem a sinner from the consequences of his guilt before the tribunal of Heaven, or to remove from his own mind the melancholy consciousness of its pollution and misery. But, though they were inefficient for these purposes, they had a utility, highly beneficent, and worthy of the wisdom which ordained them. They were intended as a system of emblematical instruction, whose striking and intelligible symbols should point out the true and only way in which sinful man can receive the saving mercy of God. "The law made nothing perfect, but was the introduction of a better hope,—the shadow of good things to come, —and could never, with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. The first tabernacle was a figure for the time then present:—but Christ being come, the High Priest of those good things which were [at that time] future, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this creation;

and not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For, if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?"

That, in some sense, Christ offered a sacrifice, will be disputed by no believer in Christianity. Our object is to ascertain the true meaning of the expression, and the objects to which it has reference. The inquiry, therefore, will be directed to the Nature, the Value, and the Efficacy of the Sacrifice attributed in Scripture to our Lord Jesus Christ.

PART I.

On the Nature and Design of the Sacrifice of Christ.

I. It will be necessary to premise some remarks on the general nature of the ancient sacrifices, and the matters of fact or the positions in doctrine which were connected with them.

A SACRIFICE, properly so called, is the so-

lemn infliction of death on a living creature, generally by effusion of its blood, in a way of religious worship; and the presenting of this act to the Deity, as a supplication for the pardon of sin, and a supposed mean of compensation for the insult and injury thereby offered to his majesty and government.

The practice of offering sacrifices to the true God, or to fictitious divinities, is known to have been a custom, in the most complete sense, universal and ancient. The records of the early history of nations, and the narratives of modern discovery, equally shew the prevalence of sacrificial rites, in all countries where they have not been superseded by Christianity. The manner in which men performed those rites shewed their strong apprehension of importance and interest in them. The inferior and less serviceable animals were not generally devoted to this purpose; but the animals of most utility to man were the usual sacrifices, and these often in large and costly numbers. Such profusion proved the serious earnestness of those who used it: yet, in instances without number, more horrid proofs were given. On great occasions of terror, or of expectation, human beings were the victims of this dire immolation. Unhappy and bewildered mortals have sought relief from the pangs of guilty dread, and have hoped to atone for past crimes by committing others still more awful:

they have given their first-born for their transgression, the fruit of their body for the sin of their soul.*

The remote antiquity of these observances is attested by the most venerable remains of classical and oriental composition: and the most ancient and authentic of documents, the sacred history, carries them back to the first family of man.

It is the opinion of some, that, in allusion and accommodation to these practices, and with a view to facilitate the reception of Christianity by gratifying the prejudices of the Jews, the New Testament represents Jesus Christ as having offered a sacrifice to God; though, in a real and proper sense, he did no such thing. These interpreters affirm that, as the Jews had a profound veneration for their temple, their priesthood, and their altar, the first Christian teachers endeavoured to ingratiate themselves and procure acceptance to their system, by finding in it likewise a priest, a sacrifice, and an altar.† To this mode of representation we object that, as an hypothesis, it is defective, and that it is contrary to the testimony of Scripture.

It is defective, as an hypothesis, in that it leaves the previous fact unaccounted for; the existence of sacrifices, their origin, and their de-

* See Supplementary Note I. at the end of the volume.

† See Supplementary Note II.

sign. An attempt is made to remove the difficulty, by alleging that the worship by sacrifices "was of the nature of a present, by way of homage to the Supreme Being."*—On this supposition, must we not deem the bloodless, innocent, and more natural offering of Cain, the fruits of the earth, more rational in itself, and more likely to be agreeable to the Deity, than that of Abel, which appears revolting to the feelings of humanity, a useless waste of animal life, and, as an act of worship, manifestly absurd? But, passing by the grossness of the invention, what conceptions must those form of the blessed God, who imagine that with such services HE could be gratified?

We also object that this notion is inconsistent with the plain language of the Scriptures, in regard both to the ancient sacrifices, and to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Evidence for both the parts of this remark we shall presently submit to the reader's judgment.

A doctrine, the reverse of that to which we have referred, appears to us the dictate of the divine oracles and of impartial reason. This is, that the ancient sacrifices were themselves only *allusions;* and that they were intended as a REPRESENTATION of the sufferings and death of the Messiah, or as a DECLARATION of the doc-

* Dr. Priestley's Notes on Scripture, Vol. i. p. 13.

trine included in that grand future fact, and taught by it.

In the communication of knowledge from man to man, the living voice is a very imperfect instrument. The extent of its use is narrowly circumscribed by infirmity and death. The advantages of man's primitive longevity were opposed by prevailing and increasing corruption: and practical wickedness must in time have effaced right impressions of religious truth. The tongues of patriarchs and prophets were soon silent in the grave: and the mere memory of their instructions, however for a time affectionately cherished, was a hazardous channel of communication for truths of infinite concern. Hence a *language of mute signs* must have appeared to possess inestimable advantages, as soon as the idea of such an instrument was entertained. Such a representative of language might be of two kinds, the *symbolical* and the *arbitrary*. The latter kind is alphabetical writing: an admirable contrivance, whether it was entirely the fruit of human ingenuity, or, as some have supposed, originating in divine communication. It is probable, that the first extensive use of this invention nearly coincided with the considerable increase of population, and the reduction of the length of human life to its present standard. The brevity, ease, and universal application of this method, have given it an almost exclusive

prevalence among the cultivated nations which have been founded to the west of the original seats of the human race.

But we have reason to think, that a more remote antiquity may be claimed for the other kind of signs, the *symbolical*. This was a system of natural significancy, in which visible objects or their pictures, and actions performed with this express design, were used to represent and convey information. This plan was prevalent in the earliest periods, and among the most ancient nations. Even at this day, a written language, which is understood by about one-third part of the human race, is of this description: the Chinese. It is founded upon the principle of employing characters, not as representatives of sounds, but as types or symbols of ideas; and it is familiarly understood by nations whose spoken dialects differ greatly.

II. Of this kind we conceive the rite of sacrificing to have been; a *symbolical action*, adapted and intended to convey important instruction. We shall offer our reasons for regarding sacrifices as thus intentionally significant; and then shall inquire into the particular ideas and moral sentiments which were so represented.

i. Our arguments in favour of the notion that sacrifices were intended as a species of symbolical language, will be drawn from their very Nature

and Form, from their Origin, and from the Sentiments of those who practised them.

1. The nature, form, and circumstances of a sacrifice carried an obvious import upon their very first aspect. The selection, presentation, and immolating of the unoffending animal, the regard paid to its blood, its consumption by fire, the solemn ceremonies which accompanied, and the particular confessions and supplications of the worshipper,—must have powerfully impressed the ideas of sin and guilt, the desert of punishment, the substitution of the innocent, and the pardon of the transgressor. When men were accustomed to symbolical actions, such a significancy would be more readily apprehended and more solemnly felt, than under our circumstances and habits. The refinements of advanced society, and the general use of letters, have made us far less sensible to the language of living signs than the ruder children of nature have always been. How much more must the impression on the heart have been increased, when *the first* sacrifice was offered: when the parents of our race, recent from their guilty fall, were abased by the divine rebuke, driven from their blissful seat, and filled with dismay at the threatening of DEATH! A threatening piercing through their souls, but of the nature and effects of which they could form none but vague ideas. But when, directed by stern authority, to apply some instrument of death to

the lamb which, with endearing innocence, had sported around them,—an act of whose effects they as yet knew nothing,—they heard its unexpected cries, they beheld the appalling sight of streaming blood, and struggling agonies, and life's last throes,—they gazed upon the breathless body,—and they were told, THIS IS DEATH: —how stricken must they have been with horror such as no description could ever paint! When, further, they had to go through all the other process of the sacrifice, their hands reluctant, and their hearts broken, and all their soul crushed down by the sad consciousness that these horrid things were the fruit of their sin, and yet contained the hope of their deliverance;—who can imagine the extremity of their feelings?

2. The origin of sacrifices we have good reason to regard as from Heaven, and not of men. In the institutes of the Levitical law, the express divine sanction is indisputable: and if we go back to the remotest times, we shall find indications of the same authority. The approbation of God is solemnly recorded to the sacrifices of Job and Abraham, Noah and Abel. But, in religious institutions, the Most High has ever been jealous of his prerogative. He alone is competent to prescribe the terms on which he will hold communion with sinful beings; and he regards as vain and presumptuous, every pretence of honouring him which he hath not warranted.

The sacrifice of blood and death, if an idea so revolting could have sprung up in a sinner's mind, could not have been offered to God without impiety, nor would he have accepted it, had not his own authority previously pointed the way by an explicit prescription.*

The goodness which pitied our first parents, in their fallen and degraded condition, furnished them with clothing from the skins of animals. It cannot, by any reasonable presumption, be supposed that those animals had been killed for food. The strong probability, therefore, is that the gracious Being who promised the Messiah as the woman's seed, confirmed the promise, and illustrated the doctrine of forgiveness through him, by the institution of sacrifices.†

Now all divine institutions are marked by the wisdom of their Author. The sabbath, the passover, the rite of baptism, and all other ordinances of worship, are significant and instructive: it is fair to infer that sacrifices were so too.

3. The sentiments of those who practised sacrificial rites are in favour of our position.

The ancient heathens universally attributed to sacrifices both significancy and efficacy. The oldest representations of their sentiments and manners bear this testimony. Of the classical productions of the western nations, the works

* See Supplementary Note III.

† See Supplementary Note IV.

of Homer are the most ancient: and who, that has read his two exquisite poems, can be ignorant that by sacrifices, performed or promised, the gods were to be appeased, and the pardon of offences procured? The primitive idea of atonement, buried as it was under idolatrous corruptions, disgraced by superstitions, and polluted with atrocities, was not totally lost.* Some of the philosophers, disgusted with the vulgar notions, or shocked at the apparent absurdity of a practice, the meaning and intent of which they knew not, expressed their surprise and disapprobation at so strange a mode of seeking the favour of the Deity: but tradition, uniting with the consciousness of guilt and the dread of punishment, had fixed the notion and practice in the minds of all nations too strongly to be eradicated by philosophic speculations. It was a doctrine held even by some of the Pythagoreans, that the purification of the soul, and its union with God, were effected by sacrifices and sacrificial fire.†

The modern Jews, though their aversion from Christianity has led them, in various important points, to abandon the theology of their ancestors, have recognized statements on this subject which we may justly esteem valuable concessions. As a specimen of passages which might

* See Supplementary Note V.

† See Supplementary Note VI.

be adduced, the following is submitted to your attention from one of their most learned and approved writers, Isaac Abrabenel. "The blood of the offerer deserved to be shed, and his body to be burned, for his sin: only the mercy of the [Divine] Name accepted this offering from him as a substitute and propitiation, whose blood should be instead of his blood, and its life instead of his life."*

These inferior authorities are valuable, inasmuch as they may be regarded as the distant emanations of primitive truth, communicated at first by the Author of truth himself. To this high source let us now carry our appeal. If, in his holy word, we find pointed declarations of the absolute inefficacy of the legal sacrifices, except connected with moral acts and dispositions; declarations addressed to the people whom he had commanded thus to worship him, and who could not neglect the observance without incurring his awful displeasure;—can we avoid the conclusion, that they were intended to inform the mind, and assist the faith, of the worshipper? Instances of such declarations in the Old Testament are obvious. "For what purpose to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jehovah. I am disgusted with the burnt-offerings of rams

* Apud Outram de Sacrif. p. 275.

and the fat of fed beasts: and in the blood of bulls and lambs and goats I delight not." "I hate, I despise your festivals; and I will not accept the odour [of sacrifices and incense] on your solemn days. Though ye present to me sacrifices and offerings, I will not accept them." —"Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not:— burnt-offering and sacrifice for sin thou dost not require."*

By these considerations it appears satisfactorily established that the intention and use of the ancient sacrifices was to be a SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATION of spiritual and important truth, and that in this view they were understood by those who practised them.

ii. We have next to inquire, WHAT truths were displayed in this symbolical language.

Let us in imagination view the striking scenery of a patriarchal or a Levitical sacrifice. A victim is selected, the best of the flock or the herd, without blemish or defect. It is brought before the altar of the Lord; its owner lays his hand upon its head; its life's blood flows upon the ground; it is divided, and burned with fire;— while the conscious sinner sees his own desert, and prays,—"Now, O Lord, I have sinned, I have committed iniquity, I have rebelled: thus and thus have I done. But I return in repent-

* Is. i. 11. Amos, v. 21. Ps. xl. 6.

ance to thy presence; and be this my expiation!"*

Could it have been difficult to perceive the solemn meaning of this significant action? Or was it possible for a serious and thinking mind to avoid recognizing and deeply feeling principles such as these?—That *sin* is an offence against the blessed God, most heinous in its evil nature, aggravated in its inseparable though varying circumstances, and absolutely insufferable before his holy presence:—that the essential righteousness of Jehovah renders it necessary and inevitable that sin should be *punished:*—that *death*, in all its tremendous meaning and extent, is the proper punishment of sin:—that the sinner is totally *unable*, by any powers or resources of his own, to escape the punishment due to his offence:—yet that God is full of *mercy*, and graciously willing to pardon the guilty offender:—that the way of pardon is through the *substitution* and sufferings of a piacular victim:—and that, on the part of the suitor for pardoning mercy, there must be such a *proprietorship* in the victim as to create a beneficiary interest; and such a *moral disposition* as cordially acquiesces in the punitive acts of divine justice.†

* An ancient Jewish form, on sacrificial occasions; ap. Outram, p. 273.

† I have great satisfaction in adding an elucidation and confirmation of these sentiments, by so distinguished an orientalist

In this solemn and affecting manner was it declared to ages and generations, that "God is

and biblical scholar as Sir John David Michaelis: and the passage is further valuable as giving a concise and luminous statement of the *purpose* intended to be answered by the most considerable parts of the ceremonial law.

"Gal. iii. 19. (PARAPHRASE.) *But*, it may be said, *still the law has been once given: what then is its object?* I answer; it was annexed till the coming of that Descendant of Abraham to whom all the promises refer, in order to convince the people of Israel of their sins, and to remind them daily of their guilt.

"(ANNOTATION.) It was the design of the Law of Moses to remind the Israelites, that they were guilty of sin and liable to death.

"1. Every *Sacrifice* was a memorial of this mournful truth. Sin was confessed over the head of the victim, and then it was slain. As it is certain that sin could not be taken away by the blood of bullocks or goats, this solemnity was no other than a memorial to the sinner, that his sin deserved death. On this account the apostle says, 'In the sacrifices—there is a remembrance of sins made again every year.'

"2. The Levitical law denounced the Israelites as *unclean*, on account of various inevitable circumstances. In particular, a human being could not be born into the world, without his mother being thereby rendered unclean. Levit. xii.

"3. At no time were the Israelites allowed to have an immediate *access to God*. Of the common Israelites, no one dared to enter into the most holy place, or even into the holy place. This 'place where God dwelt' was closed against them. Their offerings could be accepted by God only when presented through the medium of the priest.

"4. Not all those creatures of God which had been

the righteous Judge, of purer eyes than to behold evil, and who cannot countenance iniquity; that his wrath is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men; that the wages of sin is death; that there is forgiveness with the Lord, and plenteous redemption; but that without the shedding of blood there is no remission."* Inseparably associated with a sacrifice were the character and function of the person offering it; whom we call the Priest. It were to be wished that our language had a term

granted for food to Noah, were allowed to be enjoyed by the Israelites. A great part were declared unclean, and the Israelites were therefore obliged to abstain from them.

"5. As the *eating* of the sacrifice was to be an image of the complete dedication of the sacrifice, and of the propitiation effected by it; and as the expiation was especially the effect of the blood; so the eating of the blood was absolutely prohibited, (Lev. xvii. 11, 12.) in order to indicate that, with all their offerings, a *real* expiation for their sins had not been made.

"From all this, it is apparent that the law was given to be a *declaration* of the guilt of sin, and *not to take it away.* For this reason it is also called (2 Cor. iii. 7. 9.) 'the ministry which denounces death,—and condemnation:' and Paul says of it (Rom. iii. 20.) 'by the law is the knowledge of sin;' and (v. 20.) 'the law entered, that the offence might abound,' *i. e.* be shewn to be so great."

Paraphrasis und Anmerkungen über die Br. an die Gal. Eph. u. s. w. p. 26.

* Ps. vii. 11. Habak. i. 12. Rom. i. 18. vi. 23. Ps. cxxx. 4, 7. Heb. ix. 27.

answering more correctly to the ancient words used for this purpose, and which denoted a *holy person transacting with God on the behalf of others.** In the early times, the father of the family, and by the same reason the head of a clan, performed this duty for himself and on behalf of his dependants. Noah, Abraham, and Jacob were priests to their own households. Afterwards, the extension of the idea of patriarchal authority, and the importance of the office above all others, led it to be combined with the highest social dignity. In the early part of Abraham's life, the king of Salem, in whom we see that the knowledge and worship of the only God was not yet wholly supplanted among the heathen, was Melchisedec, "the priest of the Most High God." This combination of the offices took place also in remote periods of the history of idolatrous nations. In some instances by the constitution of the country, and in others by specific appointment, the same individual was both king and priest. The functions of the office included all religious worship and sacred rites; but the principal of them lay in offering solemn sacrifice to the Deity, whether acknowledged in truth or conceived of under false representations. This is plainly stated in the divine prescriptions concerning the priesthood among the

* See the first paragraphs of Discourse II.

Israelites. While the tribe of Levi generally were to perform numerous services, necessary to the public rites of religion, and therefore were priests in the wider sense of the term, it was but one family of that tribe which was permitted to offer sacrifice, the service of highest distinction: it was only "the seed of Aaron the priest that should come nigh to present the offerings of the Lord made by fire." It was also an important part of the priest's duty, and which demonstrates the beneficial character of the office, to give religious instruction, and to determine controversies concerning the meaning and application of the divine law: and it may reasonably be supposed that this instruction, among the worshippers of the true God, and where there was a conscientious regard to his will andauthority, would include so much as was understood of the moral intentions of sacrificial observances. When the Levitical priest faithfully answered to the design of his institution, "the law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with God in peace and uprightness, and converted many from iniquity: for the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he was the messenger of Jehovah [the God] of Hosts."*

Thus we have briefly endeavoured to ascertain

* See Supplementary Note VII.

the design and use of the ancient rite of sacrifice, and the truths which it was suited to inculcate upon the understandings and moral feelings of those who celebrated it.

III. We proceed now to our principal object, the application of these facts and principles to the great work of our Lord Jesus Christ as a suffering Mediator, "offering himself without spot to God." Two subjects of serious attention lie before us: the first, to evince that the ancient sacrifices were designed representations of this work and office of Christ; and the second, to shew that what they could only represent and teach, his sacrifice did truly and actually effect.

i. The ancient sacrifices were originally designed as symbols, emblems, and representations of the GREAT WORK for the effecting of which the MESSIAH was promised to fallen man.

1. In support of this proposition, our first article of evidence is deduced from explicit declarations of the Old Testament.

"Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not. A body hast thou prepared for me. Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou requirest not. Then said I, Lo, I come! In the volume of the book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will, O God; yea, thy law is within my heart."* The

* Ps. xl. 6—8. "A body hast thou prepared me." Heb.

authority of the New Testament decides the application of this passage to the Messiah. The language of rejection applied to the legal offerings can be understood only as a strong denial of any intrinsic value or efficacy in them; for the command to offer those sacrifices was unquestionably binding upon the Hebrew nation so long as the Levitical covenant continued in force. The leading idea in this distinguished passage

x. 5. and so read the LXX., and the Old Italic undoubtedly derived from it, the Æthiopic, and a MS. of the Syriac at Paris. One in the Bodleian, and the Arabic Version in Walton, combine both readings. כרה can hardly be made to signify *to bore*. It denotes primarily *to dig*, a well, for instance, or a pit; and derivatively it is employed in the sense of *acquiring* or *preparing*. Deut. ii. 6. 2 Kings vi. 23. Job xl. 30. (English division, xli. 6.) Hos. iii. 2. For אזנים therefore I venture to read, with Kennicott, and approved by Dr. Randolph, או גוה *then a body*. "The most common interpretation is, that the Psalmist alludes to the custom of boring the ears of a servant; Ex. xxi. 5, 6. But, as such allusion is very obscure, and not warranted either by the context or by any good authority, so the Psalmist speaks of *ears*, in the plural, whereas the servant had only one ear bored." (*Randolph's Citations of the N. T.* No. 159.) Tittmann, however, and other good critics, conceive that the same ultimate sense comes out of the common reading, by reducing the figures to their proper signification; and that, therefore, the apostle put σῶμα as the explanation of ὠτία. *Opuscula Theol.* p. 198—204. Leipz. 1803. Such also was the solution of our great countryman, Dr. Owen.

manifestly is, that the Messiah should supersede all the sacrificial observances, by actually performing *that very requisite*, that good pleasure of Jehovah, which they were totally unable to accomplish. Now their known and avowed intention was "to make an atonement before the Lord, for the soul that had sinned, that it might be forgiven him for all that he had done. The blood—I have given to you, [to be offered] upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls; because it is the blood which maketh atonement for the soul."* But to this point they could never attain. For this, as considered separately from their declarative intention, HE that commanded them had no delight in them. *This*, therefore, must have been the object in which the divine complacency rested; this the grand purpose for which, in due time, the Messiah should be manifested;—"TO PUT AWAY SIN BY THE SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF."

"Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec."† In this passage, which both ancient and modern Jews allow to be spoken of the Messiah, he is represented as being a priest, according to a constitution not depending on family descent, and far superior in dignity to that of

* Lev. vi. 2. 7. xvii. 11.

† Ps. cx. 4.

Aaron and his descendants; as uniting in his person the regal and the priestly character; as deriving his office immediately from God; as having no successor in it; as exercising it in the most beneficent manner, dispensing righteousness, peace, and blessing; in a word, as being truly THE SON OF GOD to whom Melchisedec could sustain only a "likeness."

"He shall sit and rule upon his throne: even he shall be Priest upon his throne."* The Messiah is here foretold by the prophet, and represented by the faithful high priest who presided in the building of the second temple, as to spring up, like a tender bud from the lowly plain, unnoticed by men; or like the day-spring from on high, gradually and surely advancing, till it is fully disclosed, the Sun of Righteousness in his own eternal majesty. It is declared that he shall collect the scattered members of that spiritual temple, in which the Gentiles from the ends of the earth shall be happy and active members; while those to whom this promise was originally made, by their refusing to listen to the voice of God, and rejecting his counsels, will be cast out from that temple or state of religious privilege, whose advantages they had awfully abused. This series of acts displays their Author as a Sovereign, exercising dominion and judicial authority. But

* See Supplementary Note VIII.

in his righteousness, grace also reigns: his royalty is exercised with mercy, and scope is afforded for this exaltation of mercy and grace, by a great expiation. He therefore is a PRIEST, while he rules as a King. But, according to the evidence before adduced, he cannot be a priest without a sacrifice. "For every high-priest is constituted for the offering of both gifts and sacrifices; whence it is necessary that this [High-Priest] should also have something which he may offer:"* and the superiority of his priesthood leads us justly to expect a correspondent dignity in the offering which he has to present.

"Seventy weeks are determined with regard to thy people, and with regard to thy holy city, to restrain the rebellion and to put a complete end to the sin, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to introduce a righteousness [which shall be for] ages, and to put a complete end to vision and prophecy, and to consecrate a holy of holies [*i. e.* to redeem and devote to God, by the *anointing* of heavenly grace, the new Gospel church, the whole company of real believers.] Know, then, and deeply consider, [that] from the going forth of the [divine] word for the return and for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, to the Messiah the Leader, shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. Thou shalt return, and it shall be re-

* Heb. viii. 3.

built, both the street and the ruined wall, even in distressful times. And, after the sixty-two weeks, the Messiah shall be cut off; and no one will be for him, [*i. e.* to defend him from his murderous enemies.] And the people of a leader to come shall destroy both the city and the sanctuary: and its end shall be with an invasion, and to the end of the war desolations are determined. Also one week shall confirm the covenant with many; and half the week shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease. And upon the pinnacle shall be the abominations of desolation; and yet he will pour out the extirpation even determined upon the desolator."* This passage

* Dan. ix. 24—27. V. 24. Literally, "anoint a holy of holies." In the former edition, I had understood this as describing the formal and proclaimed setting apart of Jesus to the Messiahship; (Heb. v. 5—10. vii. 28.) but as the expression does not in the Old Testament occur in application to any person, and was the established phrase for the inner and most holy part of the tabernacle or temple, I accede to the interpretation of Cocceius, Dathe, and Dr. Stonard (in his valuable *Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel*, p. 62, 277; London, 1825.) applying the words to the constituting and devoting to God, by the Redeemer's sacrifice and grace, of the New Testament Church, the whole company of gospel believers: (Eph. v. 25—27. 2 Cor. i. 21. Heb. x. 14.)

V. 26. אין לו "No one will be for him," to defend or deliver. I am convinced by what Dr. Stonard has advanced, that the common rendering, *not for himself*, 'must be given up, as not reconcilable with the Hebrew idiom.' (*Diss* p. 84.)

is cited thus at length, as a view of the whole is necessary to verify our construction of the clauses which apply to our present purpose. Its bearings on our subject are evident. It declares that the sacrifices and offerings once instituted by God should be abolished; that the Messiah should be given up to an untimely and violent death, though no personal demerit could be charged upon him; and that, by this great measure in the government and grace of God, a true propitiation and an everlasting righteousness should be established.

Direct your eyes now, my Christian brethren, to one of the brightest constellations in the prophetic hemisphere. That Jews, infidels, and persons bearing the Christian name but very questionable friends to the Christian cause, have denied the reference to the Messiah and to his sufferings, can excite no surprise in those who

Michaelis and Dathe prefer the reading דין לו *he shall execute judgment*, elicited from the version of Theodotion, the one inserted in our Septuagints. But they, with Blaney, understand יכרת actively, and explain the whole verse as describing the judgments of Christ upon the Jewish nation. Dr. Stonard has, I think, shewn that the preponderance of evidence is against them.

כלה ונחרצה "Extirpation even determined." The ו must be taken as exegetical, not copulative; as is proved by the very phrase in Is. x. 23. See *Noldii Partic. Heb.* p. 287. Gesenius maintains the same, and refers it to the common Hebrew mode of Hendiadys. *Handwörterbuch*, p. 277.

reflect that the most vital truths of revealed religion have always been the most eminently "a sign spoken against." But even the earliest Jewish exposition that we have (if we except the Septuagint version, which in the prophets generally, and especially in Isaiah, is disfigured with the marks of extraordinary carelessness, or ignorance of the prophet's language, or corruption,) makes the application to the Messiah:* and the reason that subsequent Jewish writers have taken an opposite course, is plainly their resolution not to admit the claims of Jesus. The New Testament, in various places, quotes or alludes to the passage as testifying of the Messiah:† and Christian writers, from the early fathers downwards,

* This appears from the following sentences of the Targum, or Chaldee Paraphrase of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, which is attributed to the apostolic age. Chap. lii. 13. "Behold, my Servant the Messiah shall act prosperously, shall be exalted, increased, and multiplied exceedingly. 14. The house of Israel has hoped for him many days.———liii. 4. He will petition on account of our sins, and our transgressions because of him will be forgiven.———10. They shall behold the kingdom of their Messiah." Yet this paraphrase, considered as a whole, is very inconsistent; and it sacrifices the plain sense of the prophet to the ideas of national dignity.

Witsius quotes a Jewish writer, Moses Alschech, as saying, "For, behold our Rabbis with one consent maintain and hand down the tradition that this is spoken concerning the King, the Messiah." *Meletemata Leid.* p. 399.

† Matt. viii. 17. Mark xv. 28. [Luke xxii. 37.] John xii. 38. Acts viii. 32. Rom. x. 16. 1 Pet. ii. 22—25. That

have received this interpretation as manifest and even self-evident; till recent times have exhibited men, under the guise of Christian teachers, who scruple not to regard themselves as better interpreters of the Scriptures than were Jesus and his apostles.*

But let us hear the distinguished portion itself, that we may judge whether its own evidence is not enough, with any candid and unprejudiced mind, to place the affirmative of the question above all rational doubt.

Isaiah lii. 13. "Behold, my servant shall be successful: he shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. 14. Though many are struck with

no citation or allusion to the passage, as a testimony to the doctrine of expiation, occurs in the Epistles of Paul, must be acknowledged to be very remarkable. The adversaries of the application have made this an argument against it. But their conclusion is evidently illogical. We have, indeed, as much of the apostolic writings preserved to us as is sufficient to convey a perfect knowledge of Christianity, yet it is not certain that we have all that any of the apostles ever committed to writing; and it is far more than probable that many of their expositions, modes of teaching, and arguments from the Old Testament, have not been so perpetuated. Though we may not be able to give an account of this, except the general reason of the apostle John (chap. xxi. 25.), it is our duty to acquiesce in it, while we cultivate gratitude for that sufficient measure of inspired writing with which we are favoured. Unless we made a far better improvement of what we possess, no reason can we have for complaining that more has not been granted to us.

* See Supplementary Note IX.

astonishment at thee; his appearance is disfigured more than that of any man, and his form more than that of any of the children of men: 15. yet shall he consecrate many nations: kings shall keep silence before him; for what had not been related to them they shall see, and what they had not heard they shall understand.——liii. 1. (—Who believeth our declaration? And to whom is the arm of Jehovah revealed?—) 2. Yet he shall spring up as a tender shoot before them [*i. e.* the Jewish people,] and as a root out of dry ground: he has no form nor beauty, that we should gaze at him; no appearance, that we should be delighted with him: 3. despised and neglected by men, a man of sorrows and familiar with sufferings, and like one who hideth his face from us [to bury his griefs in seclusion;] disdained; and we gave him no attention.

4. "Surely, our sufferings he beareth, and our pains he supporteth. But we deemed him stricken, smitten by God, and devoted to affliction. 5. Yet he is pierced for our transgressions, crushed for our iniquities: the chastisement of our reconciliation is upon him, and by his bloody stripes we have healing. 6. All we like sheep have gone astray, each to his own way have we turned, and Jehovah causeth to fall upon him the iniquity of us all. 7. It is exacted, and he answereth to it and openeth not his mouth [in any complaint, *i. e.* he entirely acquiesces in

being held responsible:] he is led forth as a lamb to slaughter, and, as a sheep before her shearers is silent, so he openeth not his mouth. 8. From custody and from sentence he is taken away: but who of his generation attendeth to it? Since he is cut off out of the land of the living; from the transgression of my people the stroke is upon them, [*i. e.* the divine judgment upon his persecutors and murderers.] A grave is assigned him with the wicked; but his tomb is a rich man's: for he hath done no injustice, and no guile is in his mouth.

10. "But Jehovah is pleased to crush him with sufferings!

"If he will offer himself a sacrifice for sin, he shall see his posterity, he shall prolong his days, and the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. 11. The effects of his soul's pain he shall see, and shall be richly satisfied. By his knowledge my righteous servant shall make many righteous, and shall take away their iniquities.

12. "Therefore I will give him his portion with princes, and with mighty men he shall share the spoil: because he yieldeth his life to death, and is numbered with transgressors; yea, the sin of many he beareth, and intercedeth for transgressors."*

* The reasons of this attempted translation will be so far

This distinguished portion of evangelical prophecy needs no laboured elucidation. If the Scriptures are of any use to mankind, if they convey any definite sentiments, if we can at all

apparent to biblical scholars as to require but few explanations. Lii. 13. "Be successful." The word signifies, first, *to act with wisdom and prudence;* and thence it takes the secondary sense of *obtaining success and prosperity*, as the natural and ordinary result of judicious conduct. V. 14. "Appearance,—form." Of the two words thus translated, the former denotes the general aspect, and the latter the personal figure or stature. V. 15. "Consecrate;" literally *sprinkle*, referring, as many of the best writers have remarked, to the use of water and blood in the ceremonial expiations and purifications of the law. Some deduce the verb from another origin, giving the sense of causing to rejoice; yet, I humbly think, with less evidence than belongs to the usual interpretation. Liii. 2. לפניו "before him; *i. e.* either Jehovah, or the Jewish people who are often spoken of as a singular object. With either reference, a good sense is effected; but I incline to the latter, as it appears to be more in accordance with the connexion, presenting the image of the meek and holy One rising up among his own people, in their very sight, but contemptuously neglected by them. V. 5. "Peace' restored is *reconciliation.* The expression is well known to denote that the *peace* is the EFFECT of the *chastisement.* "Bloody stripes." The proper English term would be *wheals;* but it might appear too vulgar a word for so sacred a subject. V. 8. *To think upon, meditate, attend to,* is the proper meaning of שוח, and this will scarcely comport with the common interpretations. את־דור in the strictest use of the language, may be a nominative absolute.

See Supplementary Note X.

rely on the meaning of words, if the strength and variety of phrase here employed by the wisdom of inspiration can avail to inform and impress our minds, — WE MUST believe that the Messiah would devote himself as a voluntary SACRIFICE, a real and effectual EXPIATION, suffering the heaviest woes and all the bitterness of DEATH, in concurrence with the gracious intentions of Jehovah, and for the salvation of rebellious men. In this view of the passage, which seems an inevitable result of impartial attention to it, the idea is manifestly included, that those sacrificial rites, to which perpetual allusion is made, were representative of this great propitiation, and intended to be a symbolical prediction of it.

2. The authority of the New Testament furnishes additional proof of the reference which the ancient sacrifices bore to the great work of Christ.

The opinion has been mentioned before, that the sufferings of Christ are called a sacrifice in a figurative sense, and merely in accommodation to an ancient practice and long-established habits, or rather to the barbarous prejudices of a rude age. I hope that the evidence already adduced from other sources, may have appeared, to impartial consideration, sufficient to shew that opinion to be destitute of any solid foundation. But I now request the candid reader to observe and judge, whether that, or the contrary sentiment which we

have been endeavouring to establish, is most compatible with the plain declarations of the Christian scriptures. In the introduction of this discourse quotations were read from the connection of our text, which strongly asserted the emblematical intention of the ceremonial law. Declining to repeat those passages, I add to them the following.

" Behold, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world! Christ, our passover, was sacrificed for us. Christ loved us, and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God. —The redemption which is by Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth a propitiatory sacrifice,* through faith, by his blood. Ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things,—but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. He is the propitia-

* Rom. iii. 25. " A propitiatory sacrifice :" ἱλαστήριον of course requires the supplying of its understood substantive; and though ἐπίθεμα be often that substantive, here θῦμα is more congenial to the explanatory clause, " by his blood." V. *Hutchinson in Xenoph. Anab.* 1785, p. 12. *Hesychius, Alberti,* ii. 41. *Biel Thesaur. in LXX,* and above all, *Schleusneri Lex.* But if the ellipsis of ἐπίθεμα be preferred, the effect will be the same; for the sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy-seat was the presentation of the sacrifice already offered. Ἐν, corresponding to the Hebrew ב, requires to be rendered *by, in,* o *with,* as the subject and connexion suggest.

tion for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the [sins of the] whole world. Who hath not daily need, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, then for those of the people: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. Now once, on the completion of the dispensations, he hath been manifested for the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of himself. It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but [in contrast to them] this [High Priest], when he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.—Thus it is written, and thus IT WAS NECESSARY that the Messiah should suffer. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing!"*

Presumptuous and nugatory would it be, to attempt any addition to the strength and clearness of these divine testimonies. We only desire that they may be honestly and fairly understood, according to the established and rational rules of interpretation which we apply to the text of any ancient author.

* John i. 29. 1 Cor. v. 7. Eph. v. 2. Rom. iii. 25. 1 Pet. i. 19. 1 John ii. 2. Heb. chapters vii. ix. x. throughout. Luke xxiv. 46. Rev. v. 12.

3. The plain evidence of scripture does not require inferior aid, and the proof of our proposition is rested here. But it deserves our observation, that the providence of God has, in this instance, illustrated his word, by a striking and memorable interposition. Within a few years after the death of Christ, the offering of the daily sacrifice in the temple of Jerusalem utterly ceased; and has never been restored. Indeed, the destruction of the temple, and the irretrievable loss of the Levitical genealogies, have put it out of the power of man to offer a sacrifice according to the divine law. That law was provisional; "a shadow of good things to come." Its purpose has been fully answered: and by the finger of Omnipotence its expiration is recorded on the everlasting columns of historic truth.

ii. We proceed to shew that all the objects which the typical sacrifices represented or declared, are REALLY EFFECTED by the SACRIFICE of CHRIST.

1. It is a demonstration of the most momentous and interesting truths, respecting the PERFECTIONS and GOVERNMENT of GOD.

He is here manifested as the MOST HOLY ONE, irreconcileable to sin, of purer eyes than to behold evil, and in whose presence nothing that defileth shall ever stand. Had sin been pardoned and its guilt cancelled, by the exercise

of sovereign will, or by an act of mere power; it might have been doubted whether the Almighty were indeed infinite in moral rectitude: it might have been surmised that sin was not so extremely odious in his sight as his word represents, nor holiness so absolutely necessary to the happiness of a rational being. But no such injurious apprehensions can be entertained by those who devoutly study the divine purity as it appears in the doctrine of Christ crucified. Sin is pardoned, but it is not palliated. On the contrary, it is branded with a deeper and more awful mark of Jehovah's abhorrence than if no interposition of grace had been vouchsafed, but the weight of vengeance had fallen on the heads that deserved it.

The JUSTICE of Heaven is displayed. This perfection of the Divine Nature is, indeed, but a necessary exercise of its essential and unchanging rectitude. "Justice is goodness directed by wisdom," says the judicious Bishop Stillingfleet. The same inspired word which tells us that God is love, tells us also that God is righteous, who taketh vengeance. And the positions are in perfect harmony. It is a necessary and honourable part of the goodness of God that he sets himself against sin. It is in the sufferings of the Saviour, as a sacrifice for the sins of those whom he hath loved, so as to give himself for them, that sin is

most clearly shewn to be deserving of all the detestation which the word of God expresses, and all the punishment which it denounces. The sincere Christian's abhorrence to sin is confirmed and increased, by every discovery of its intrinsic demerit: but such discoveries he makes, in the most convincing and affecting manner, in looking to Jesus, who knew no sin, yet was made sin for us; the spotless and unblemished Victim, who bore our sins in his own body on the cross. Here, too, the persevering transgressor may meditate terror; for if God spared not his own Son, when, by a constitution of wise and holy mercy, he was numbered among the transgressors, what will be the end of those, whose personal and persevering guilt equally tramples on the authority of his law, and insults the grace of his gospel? "If these things were done in the green wood, what shall be done in the dry?"

The LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY of God is brought to view in its rightful honours. His law is shown to be of the most reasonable character, and of indissoluble obligation; for it is holy, just, and good. It is the expression of his own moral perfection, and he cannot permit it to be depreciated with impunity. It is the most moderate demand that can in any reason be imagined, of excellence which deserves thus to be honoured, and of dominion which requires thus

to be obeyed. A lower requirement cannot be conceived, without charging God with indifference to his perfection and dereliction of his honour. What does his law demand, but that HE should be loved and honoured *proportionably to his merit?* More he does not enjoin: less, it would be infinitely dishonourable in him to require or to accept. The righteousness of the requirement, and the correspondent equity of its sanction, are shewn forth in their just glory by the obedience unto death of Jesus the Son of God. Put under the law, he hath magnified it and made it honourable, and is become the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

The glory of eternal WISDOM is here manifested, in the formation of a moral constitution, by which the guilt and punishment of sin, so far as was necessary for the purposes of sacrificial atonement, were assumed by the sinless Victim; and the worth of his obedience and his sufferings becomes imputable, on grounds of right and reason, to the sinner who is brought to a cordial acquiescence in this plan of holiness and grace. The foundation of this divine constitution is laid in a *union* of nature and covenant relationship, between the meritorious Sufferer and those for whom he suffers, so that a reciprocal proprietorship is made to exist. Striking resemblances to such a constitution of things are not wanting in

the visible government of providence:* and whoever has attentively considered the amount of human knowledge on the subject of cause and effect, must, I think, of necessity admit that this doctrine of a moral union between Christ and his people rests upon an unshaken foundation of philosophical truth.†

Thus a way is opened for the exercise of MERCY and GRACE in a manner perfectly honourable to the attributes and government of God. He appears a just God and a Saviour: he is just, and yet he justifieth him that believeth in Jesus. And of all the condescensions of mercy, of all the gifts of divine generosity, can any be esteemed comparable with this? "God commendeth his love towards us, in that, when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son, to be the propitiation for our sins!"

2. By the sacrifice of himself, Jesus Christ voluntarily SUSTAINED that suffering which was the marked PUNISHMENT of sin,‡ and expressly with this view, He was "made a curse for us."

We have seen that the idea of substitution, or vicarious suffering, was essential to the theory of sacrifices, as understood and practised by profane and sacred antiquity, and as we have abund-

* See *Butler's Analogy*, particularly Part II. chap. v.

† See Supplementary Note XI.

‡ See Supplementary Note XII.

ant reason to believe, originally instituted by God himself. Let us now inquire whether the scriptures do not, in clear and express terms, attribute the same idea to the sufferings and death of our blessed Redeemer.

The passages quoted under the foregoing head of this discourse,* are all strictly in point as evidence for our present purpose; and their testimony appears to me so full, particular, and strong, that I am unable to conceive how it can be eluded in any other way than by assuming principles which would nullify the use of language, and destroy all means of moral certainty. I need not repeat those quotations; and the addition of further testimonies might seem superfluous. But different testimonies present the same truth in different points of view, so as to serve the purpose of mutual illustration: and these varied aspects are highly useful in their adaptation to men's different mental constitutions. Let us keep in sight the precise point, for the evidence and illustration of which the following are adduced, and the preceding texts recollected: that, in virtue of the *union* constituted by the wisdom and grace of God, between the Saviour and mankind, he voluntarily *put himself in their place* and suffered as if he had been a transgressor, in order that they might be delivered from the

* P. 25—34.

guilt, or legal condemnation, of their sins, and, by consequence, from the pollution and practical power of sin.

"The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many. I am the good Shepherd: I lay down my life for the sheep: therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again: this commandment have I received of my Father. —This is my blood, the blood of the new covenant, the blood shed on the behalf of many, for the remission of sins.*—To feed the church of the Lord which he hath acquired to himself by his own blood.† In whom we have redemption by his blood, the forgiveness of our offences, accord-

* Matt. xxvi. 28. This repetition seems the readiest way of expressing the twice repeated emphasis of the original, and which is evidently designed to impress the importance of the great constituent of a sacrifice, the *blood* of the victim shed.

† Acts xx. 28. "Lord;" the reading established by a satisfactory preponderance of evidence. "Acquired to himself:" fairness requires that περιποιεῖσθαι should be thus rendered. It is a general word, and does not refer to the particular notion of *purchasing*, but to any method of obtaining and preserving a possession to one's self. It occurs only here and in 1 Tim. iii. 13. but many times in LXX. yet never with the idea of purchase. The same may be said of its correlate substantive, which occurs in these places: Eph. i. 14. 1 Thess. v. 9. 2 Thess. ii. 14. Heb. x. 39. 1 Pet. ii. 9.

ing to the riches of his grace. Who gave himself for us, that he might ransom us from all iniquity. Who gave himself a ransom for all. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Who himself bare our sins, in his own body, on the cross: by whose stripes ye are healed. If one died for all then (ἄρα, in effect) did the all die;" that is, upon the constitution of mediatorial grace, and relatively to the great ends of law. "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. For him that knew no sin, [God] hath made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.—They fell down before the Lamb:—and they sing a new song, saying, Thou art worthy,—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood!"*

Such is the current of the scripture testimony to the nature, design, and end of the sufferings of Jesus the Messiah. These passages have been recited in their briefest form, and detached from their respective connection: but if the candid inquirer will study each of them in its proper place, and with the closest regard to the continuity of sentiment, it is my serious conviction that the impression made by this insulated repre-

* Matt. xx. 28. John x. 15—18. Matt. xxvi. 28. Acts xx. 28. Eph. i. 7. Tit. ii. 14. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Gal. iii. 13. 2 Cor. v. 14. 1 Pet. ii. 24. iii. 18. 2 Cor. v. 21. Rev. v. 9.

sentation will be confirmed and increased.* A writer of eminence in the polite world, who knew extremely little of theological systems, but who, emerging from a careless infidelity, read the Scriptures with attention and good sense, has described, with regard to our present subject, the effect produced on his mind by such an unbiassed study of the sacred books. "That Christ suffered and died as an atonement for the sins of mankind, is a doctrine so constantly and so strongly enforced through every part of the New Testament, that whoever will seriously peruse those writings, and deny that it is there, may, with as much reason and truth, after reading the works of Thucydides and Livy, assert, that in them no mention is made of any facts relative to the histories of Greece and Rome."†

Indeed I must sit down in hopeless scepticism, and abandon all reliance on evidence and reasoning, if I refuse to admit it as the doctrine taught in scripture, that the Saviour of mankind voluntarily yielded himself a sacrifice of expiation, bearing the guilt and punishment of sin not his own: when prophets, and apostles, and his own supreme authority, concur in bearing this testimony to his sufferings and the glories that should follow.

"Ought not the Christ to have suffered these

* See Supplementary Note XIII.

† Soame Jenyns's Internal Evidence, p. 29.

things?" That is, was it not fit, proper, and necessary, in the eye of that All-perfect Being who had constructed the plan of human salvation; and who had so constructed it as to meet all the exigencies of the case, both with respect to the wants of the sinner, and the regards due to his own righteous government. The Saviour came to suffer. The chief part of his humiliation was his obedience unto death, even the death of the cross. Throughout his mortal course, he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: but especially the closing scenes of his life were the accumulation of woe. Then was the hour of his enemies, and the power of darkness. We are incompetent to form a proper conception of the precise nature and the degree of suffering, to which the dying Redeemer submitted. Excruciating were the pains inflicted on his bodily frame, which could not but be delicate and susceptible to a very high degree. But all these were light, compared with the distress of his holy soul. We may be assured, that the severity of his mental sufferings unspeakably exceeded the most affecting ideas that we can form. His agony and bloody sweat, his pungent sense of the triumphs of wickedness and the keen insults of finished malignity, the piercing of his heart by those whom he so generously loved, the bitter cries and supplications and tears which the wondrous Sufferer poured out to his Heavenly Father,

—we, alas, can but very feebly and unworthily appreciate! Yet those were but the index of his internal and silent sorrows!

With respect to the degree of intensity in the sufferings of Jesus, it could not have been less than it actually was, or assuredly it would have been. When the Righteous Father was pleased to crush him with that dreadful and fatal stroke, he still ceased not to delight in the Son of his love. One shade of grief would not have passed over his soul, which infinite holiness and wisdom did not perceive to be necessary. "It BECAME him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

It is, I humbly conceive, worse than improper to represent the sufferings of Jesus Christ, in their last and most terrible extremity, as the same with those of condemned sinners in the state of punishment. In the case of such incorrigible and wretched criminals, there is a leading circumstance which could not, by any possibility, exist in the suffering Saviour. They "eat of the fruit of their own way, and are filled with their own devices." A most material part of their misery consists in the unrestrained power of sinful passions, for ever raging but for ever ungratified. Their minds are constantly torn with the racking consciousness of personal guilt; with mutual ag-

gravations and insults; with the remorse of despair: with malice, fury, and blasphemy against the Holy and Blessed God himself; and with an indubitable sense of Jehovah's righteous abhorrence and rejection of them. No such passions as these, nor the slightest tincture of them, could have place in the breast of the holy Jesus. That meek and purest Lamb offered himself without spot. His heart, though broken and bleeding with agonies to us unknown, ever felt a perfect resignation to the hand that smote him, and a full acquiescence in all the bitterness of the cup which was appointed him to drink: the resignation and acquiescence of love and conviction. He suffered in such a manner as a being perfectly holy could suffer. Though, animated by the joy that was set before him, he endured the cross and despised the shame; yet there appear to have been seasons in the hour of his deepest extremity, in which he underwent the entire absence of divine joy and every kind of comfort or sensible support. What but a total eclipse of the sun of consolation, could have wrung from him that exceedingly bitter and piercing cry, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?"—The fire of Heaven consumed the sacrifice. The tremendous manifestations of God's displeasure against sin he endured, though in him was no sin: and he endured them in a manner of which even those unhappy spirits who shall drink the fierceness of

the wrath of Almighty God, will never be able to form an adequate idea! They know not the HOLY and EXQUISITE SENSIBILITY which belonged to this immaculate Sacrifice. That clear sight of the transgressions of his people in all their heinousness and atrocity, and that acute sense of the infinite vileness of sin, its baseness, ingratitude, and evil in every respect which he possessed,—must have produced, *in him*, a feeling of extreme distress, of a kind and to a degree which no creature, whose moral sense is impaired by personal sin, can justly conceive. As such a feeling would accrue from the purity and ardour of his love to God and holiness, acting in his *perfectly peculiar* circumstances; so it would be increased by the pity and tenderness which he ever felt towards the objects of his redeeming love. A wise and good father is more deeply distressed by a crime which his beloved child has perpetrated, than by the same offence if committed by an indifferent person.

It should also be considered that our doctrine concerning the design and the effect of the sufferings of Jesus, has not produced those sufferings. They are the same, and the facts are unalterable, whatever opinion be set up concerning their reason and moral cause, under the divine government. Which hypothesis, then, is the most worthy of the wisdom and benevolence of God; the one which attributes to the sufferings of our Lord an

effect beyond all description important and valuable, conferring infinite good upon innumerable myriads of beings, and spreading its beneficent influence through all eternity; or the other, which regards *the same* sufferings as nothing more than a proof of the sufferer's integrity, and an example of patient endurance, to be imitated by other sufferers if they should be so disposed?—Neither could the sufferings of Christ, if their expiatory quality be put out of the consideration, be of any service as a declaration of the general mercy of God, and his readiness to pardon sinners upon repentance: for how could the analogy or the argument be constructed? Surely it would, in all reason, bear the contrary way. If that pure and spotless One, in whom the Father was ever well pleased, was pressed down with a load so dreadful, not of outward sufferings only, but of an inward and mysterious anguish, the intenseness of which we have no means nor power of computing; what must be expected to fall upon us, who are conscious of transgressions innumerable and unspeakable against the law and majesty of Heaven?

Here let us pause, and admire, and adore. The sacrifice of Christ is not merely a great fact in history, nor merely a foundation for interesting reasonings in theological science; but it touches the most intimate feelings, it affects the highest welfare of every heart. How malignant

must be that evil, that enormous and detestable evil, which the unerring wisdom of God sees unfit to be pardoned without this astonishing expiation! O that we may hate it with perfect hatred, and resist it with unremitted vigour! With what lowly adoration and admiring praises should we contemplate the eternal and infinite love of God, in providing such a sacrifice! Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace embrace each other.—Who can unfold the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge? This is the bread of life, which came down from heaven; his flesh which he gave for the life of the world. How great, beyond expression, was the condescension of the eternal Son of God, assuming our nature, bearing our griefs and sorrows, the penal consequences of our sins, and yielding up his own invaluable life under agonies unspeakable, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, from the guilt and power of our ruinous apostacy! "Hereby perceive we his love, that he laid down his life for us.—Unto him that loveth us, and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood,—be glory and dominion, for ever and ever!"

We proceed to state a further effect of this great measure in the grace and government of God.

3. The sacrifice of Christ is a full and perfect SATISFACTION* to the honour and justice of the

* See Supplementary Note XIV.

divine government in pardoning and saving sinners. In other words, it has effected a perfect RECONCILIATION and harmony between two apparently incompatible principles; on the one hand, the equity and wisdom of God's moral legislation, in all the propriety of requirement, and the veracity of denunciation; and, on the other, the exercise of his benevolence, in rescuing from ruin, and restoring to holiness and happiness those of mankind whom, out of a principle of sovereign and absolute grace, (not indeed arbitrarily, but for reasons infinitely weighty, though not revealed to mortals,) he may judge proper thus to bless.

That some instances of sin, though only between fellow-creatures, have a real and proper *desert* of suffering as a penalty, few can so violate the dictates of reason and moral feeling, as to deny. In the universal estimation and the ordinary language of men, acts of deep and malicious injury, of enormous cruelty, perfidy, and ingratitude, call for *condign* punishment. If we were considerate and impartial enough to extend our views to the whole moral universe, including *in a due manner* its glorious and infinite Sovereign, we should be convinced that HIS claims on the entire affection and devoted obedience of his rational creatures are infinitely superior to those of an earthly parent, friend, or benefactor, under any conceivable circumstances; that a violation of

those claims has a *proportionate* criminality; and that, on the principles of equal justice, every such violation deserves an adequate punishment. On the question, *what* punishment is *adequate*, can any one be so bold as to deny that God alone is the perfect, competent, and unexceptionable Judge? And if, in his accredited revelation, he has informed us of the result of that unimpeachable judgment, is it wise, or safe, or pious, for us to entertain a different opinion? The scriptures are full of solemn declarations of God's punitive justice. He has both affirmed the claim of eternal righteousness, and declared his resolution to carry it into execution. "Wilt thou, forsooth, condemn UNBOUNDED JUSTICE?—According to a man's work, will he render unto him: and according to the ways of a man shall it befal him. Woe unto the wicked! Ill to him! For the retribution of his works shall be done to him. The judgment of God is righteous, and according to truth. He is righteous in taking vengeance. Vengeance is mine; I will repay; saith the Lord. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."* He will treat sin, and deal with sinners *as they deserve*, but not *beyond* the measure of their desert. "Justice and judgment," not blind passion, "are the foundation of his

* Job xxxiv. 17, 18. Dr. Mason Good's Transl. Is. iii. 11 Rom. i. 32. ii. 2. iii. 5. Heb. x. 30.

throne." The most cursory reader of the divine word, must be aware how much and how strongly it speaks of the deep, fixed, unalterable, and infinitely terrible DISPLEASURE of the great Jehovah against sin. The most vehement expressions are borrowed from the affections, actions, and language of mankind, to set before us this all-important idea. We are assured, in the most awakening terms, of the anger, the indignation, the wrath, the fury, of God against sin and sinners. Every one must admit that this is the language of condescension to the weakness of human conceptions, under the necessary circumstances of a primitive language, when men had not proceeded to the invention of more abstract and philosophical terms; and that it must be understood in a manner congruous with the perfection of the Divine Nature. No agitations or emotions, no mutability of knowledge or will, can be for a moment admitted. A careful survey of the whole testimony of the Scriptures, in this view, will show us that the design of these awfully sublime expressions is to represent to us God's necessary and infinite abhorrence of moral evil; and his determination to give all suitable evidences or expressions of that abhorrence. Those expressions must be *public*, or they would not answer the end of vindicating the divine righteousness: and they must be of such a kind, and enforced to such a degree, as shall be *adequate*

to all the purposes of divine wisdom. But it is evident that, of the measure which shall constitute adequacy, God alone can judge, and fix it with the perfection of rectitude.

That sin, then, should be punished according to its desert, the supremacy, holiness, justice, and veracity, of the Most High absolutely require. But how can it be consistent with those perfections to punish the innocent?—Unquestionably it would be wrong to punish the innocent, as innocent, and irrespectively of any relative or compensative arrangement by which the party, though personally blameless, might suffer to the advantage of the whole case in judgment, and without ultimate injury to himself or to any. If such an instance as included these conditions could be found, the objection would in that case be disarmed. What parent would not undergo the severest labours, difficulties, and sufferings, to save a dear child from calamity or death?—And, even with regard to the affairs of the present life, the all-wise dominion of Providence not infrequently exhibits instances of individuals plunged into extreme distress and acute sufferings, in consequence of faults, in the commission of which they had no share: and still more commonly and extensively, are men, even to a remote posterity, benefited by the virtues of others, to which they have not contributed in the smallest degree. Though such cases fall

infinitely short of a parallelism to the grand instance of Redemption by the Sacrifice of Christ, yet they serve to shew that the notion of moral substitution has its foundation in the constitutions of nature, as fixed by their Almighty Author.

But, before any person can reasonably reject the doctrine of a moral satisfaction, by the sufferings and death of the spotless Sacrifice, in order that the immunity and happiness of the guilty may consist with the legislative honour and the judicial veracity of God; it behoves him to weigh well the *absolute peculiarity* of the case, and to consider it in *its own proper* and *singular* circumstances. Is he perfectly acquainted with *all the reasons* which determine the Being who is infinite in wisdom, equity, and benevolence, to punish sin? And be it ever remembered, that, in his most sacred word, that Being has proclaimed this determination. Is the objector aware of all the *ends* which God proposes, in conducting this department of his holy government? Has he been admitted into the eternal counsels? Is he prepared to shew that those ends and purposes may not be attained, *equally well*, or *unspeakably better*, by the method of a vicarious interposition, than by leaving the righteous vengeance to fall where it is personally due?* May not the ho-

* The reader will find these suggestions most admirably enforced in Maclaurin's Essay on Prejudices against the Gospel.

liness, wisdom and truth of the Eternal Sovereign be preserved inviolate, his rectoral honour maintained in untarnished lustre, and his law shown to be supremely just and good;—may not sin be held up in its true colours, to the abhorrence and execration of the universe;—may not every desirable effect be produced on the mind of the pardoned and restored sinner:—in fine, may not all the ends and designs of justice, wisdom, and mercy, known to mortals or unknown, be accomplished in this way, WITH INFINITE ADVANTAGE?

If still this method of grace be rejected, the condition of sinful man assumes a fearful form. Either the actual offender must undertake to meet the punitive justice of Heaven, or he must suspend his soul on the expectation that no such justice will be found to exist. Miserable alternative! Either that the denounced wrath of God is a trifle, or that his denunciations themselves are swelling words of vanity!

We have said that the case before us is one of *absolute peculiarity*. To this, let me for a few moments, solicit your attention.

That excellent author was the brother of the great mathematician, Colin Maclaurin, and possessed a mind of similar acutenets and vigour. A series of solid and accurate reasonings on this subject is also in President Edwards's Posthumous Remarks on Important Theological Controversies; Chap. VI. Works, Vol. viii.

(1.) The Divine Person who undertook this great work of redemption, was perfectly *independent*, as to the accidents and relations of created existence; *free*, to purpose and to execute the design; and *able*, to go through with it triumphantly, in doing and suffering whatever was requisite, without ruin or eventual injury to himself. "Lo, I come! I delight to do thy will, O God. Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it again; this commission I have received from my Father."

(2.) He had a perfect *knowledge* of all that was requisite to the accomplishment of his undertaking: with infinite comprehension and accuracy, and in all the circumstances, connections, bearings, and consequences of his awful engagement. No part of his labours and sorrows was unforeseen by him. In the approach of the dread catastrophe, how minutely did he predict it: how did he long that his baptism of sufferings might be accomplished! "He knew all things, he knew when his hour was come: he knew when all things were accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled."

(3.) His engagement was perfectly *voluntary*, and the object of his infinite complacency. "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own

will," any private or separate objects, "but the will of him that sent me. My meat and my drink is to do his will, and to finish his work."

(4.) In assuming our nature, he formed a *union* with the objects of his generous condescension, the guilty and ruined children of men. This union includes all the ideas of natural relation, legal guardianship, tender love, representative interest, holy conformity, and covenant establishment. This gracious constitution is represented in scripture, by comparisons adapted to convey the highest conceptions of its intimacy and importance. Christ is to his redeemed, what the husband is to the wife, the foundation to the building, the head to the animal system, and the vine to the branches. Such a union as this constitutes a ground, in the reason of things, in the feelings and common estimation of men, and in the appointment of God, for that *reciprocal proprietorship*, which is in scripture so emphatically called, his being "made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Thus, in the case before us, no injury is done to the illustrious Sufferer by his stupendous act of benevolence and generosity to guilty man;—infinite good accrues to the cause of moral right and to the general interests of the universe;—an intercommunity of relation exists between the Saviour and his redeemed, so as to form a just

reason for regarding them as *one*, in a federal and legal sense;—and the reality of this union, when reduced to practical and personal application, secures the existence of genuine holiness in the very fact of any becoming possessed of a beneficiary interest in it.

Where such conditions as these exist, though in a degree very low and imperfect, the idea of *imputation* and *substitution*, as to moral and political merit or demerit, is undeniably agreeable to the common understanding, feelings, and practice of mankind.

These considerations have been adduced with a view to prove the reasonableness of our doctrine; and to shew that the chief objection which has been brought against it, is founded on crude conceptions and superficial views: as the limited notions of the vulgar, formed on first appearances, often lead them to disbelieve and deride the demonstrated truths of enlarged philosophy.

Let us not, however, suppose that all the reasons, relations, and effects of the GREAT PROPITIATION are known to us. Herein are deposited treasures of wisdom and knowledge, which angels desire to look into, and which the studies of immortality will not exhaust. If we knew, or could know, nothing besides the naked fact of atonement and redemption by the death of Christ, the TESTIMONY OF GOD affirming that fact would be, to a mind that reasoned and felt

rightly, satisfactory and decisive. "For this is the testimony, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is by his Son." This divine testimony is the *proper* ground of FAITH, the holy faith which has the promise of salvation. God, who cannot lie, has assured us that Christ has been once offered to bear the sins of many, that he was legally constituted sin and a curse for us, and that in him, as the propitiation for our sins, we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of the Father's grace. "God commendeth his love to us, in that, when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us: much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." In a simple and cordial acceptance of this testimony; in an humble, and holy, and unshaken reliance upon this rock of ages; let us rejoice. It is all our salvation and all our desire.

PART II.

On the Proper VALUE *of the Redeemer's Sacrifice.*

The language of the apostle attributes an incomparable excellence to the act of our divine Redeemer in offering this sacrifice for sins. "*How much more* shall the blood of Christ"—

effect the specified purposes? Our subject in this view, requires attention to three points, the PERSON who presents the sacrifice, the SUBJECT of the sacrifice, and the particular CIRCUMSTANCE in which its value consists.

I. The person who presents the sacrifice is JESUS the CHRIST, the Mediator between God and man, and the High-Priest in his own spiritual temple.

The term Anointed, Messiah, or Christ, is undoubtedly a name of office, derived from the ancient mode of designating persons to any of the three important functions of priesthood, prophecy, and royalty. Under this name and as including these functions, the Redeemer of mankind was promised. We have before seen that the predictions of the Old Testament represent him in the character of a priest, as well as a sacrifice. This office of Christ is the express topic of a considerable part of this Epistle to the Hebrew Christians. He is here largely and particularly shewn to be the pre-eminent High-Priest, the King of righteousness and peace; prefigured by those who held a typical priesthood in the ecclesiastical polity of the Hebrews; incomparably superior to them, being in fact the only true and efficacious Priest, acting with God on man's behalf; and the exercise of whose office, in grace, power, and glory, shall continue for ever.

With what gratitude and encouragement ought we to reflect, that we have SUCH a High Priest over his own house; the Son of God, the Lord of glory, the Author and Finisher of our faith; the Minister of the heavenly sanctuary, doing in that exalted state every thing that is necessary for completing the purposes of his sacrifice offered on earth, and for conveying all the blessings of salvation to all who apply for them sincerely and in his name; the Surety and Mediator of the new and better covenant, confirming its declarations, pledging himself for the fulfilment of its promises, and bestowing its blessings; by whose blood we have liberty to draw nigh to God, in all the acts of direct devotion, in the habitual reflections and communings of the soul, and in the last moments of our mortal course; who, having offered the one sacrifice to propitiate for sins, is sat down for ever on the right hand of the throne of God, the state of the highest dignity, authority, and power for all the objects of benignity and righteousness; merciful and faithful in condescending to all our wants, and adapting his blessings to our circumstances, thus sympathizing with us in our infirmities and sorrows, succouring the tempted and distressed, and saving to the uttermost those who come unto God by him!

For the discharge of this momentous office, the Lord Jesus possesses a perfect fitness, on

account of the union of the human and the divine natures in his mysterious person.

Being to act on the behalf of men, he is a real and proper MAN. "It behoved him to be made, in all things,—yet without sin, like unto his brethren;" a partaker of flesh and blood, as the rest of the children of Adam. "Such a High Priest became us; holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners."

If, however, we rested here, we should only "know Christ after the flesh:" a knowledge of little profit, compared with the vast extent of our necessities, and the high import of his character and work as the Saviour of mankind. It is a striking declaration of the eternal God, "I, even I, am Jehovah; and besides me there is no SAVIOUR."* But the very intention of our Lord's priesthood is to "SAVE *to the uttermost*," to the fullest extent of time, and consequently in the highest sense, "them that come unto God by him."† If he performs the work which belongs to God alone, he must have the nature of God. Accordingly, at the very commencement of this epistle, the design of the apostle is unfolded, to shew the value of Christianity by arguing from the dignity of its Author. Our great High Priest is there described as not only the messenger of God, but the Brightness of his

* Isa. xliii. 11. † See Supplementary Note XV.

glory, and the Express Image of his manner of existence:* all the other messengers of God are commanded to adore him: and to him are addressed the magnificent words, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but THOU remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but THOU art the same, and thy years shall not fail!"

* After considerable research and consideration, I have been brought to the opinion that this periphrasis is the nearest approach to expressing the exact meaning of ὑπόστασις in this passage. See *Budæi Comment. Ling. Gr.* p. 688, 689. ed. Bas. 1557. Michaelis translates it (Abdruck seines Wesens) *impression of his Essence.* Dr. Leander Van Ess, who is very judicious in his selection of phraseology, has (Ebenbild s. W.) *copy* or *model of his Essence.* The same was probably the intention of Le Maistre de Sacy, whose felicitousness of expression, as well as his fidelity to the meaning, in his Version of the Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, are truly admirable. The elder Rosenmüller, who was not likely to have given such a comment if not induced by insurmountable evidence, gives this explanation: "It denotes God himself. The Son is called the absolutely perfect Image of the Father, because he is like him in power, wisdom, goodness, &c. since, by a *son*, we understand one of the same nature as the father." Schleusner paraphrases the two appellations, "The express resemblance of the Essence or Nature of God, and of his unchangeable Majesty."

It was necessary thus to mention this great truth of Christianity, so much opposed and not seldom misrepresented; though it would be improper here to digress so far as to submit even an outline of its various evidence. I would only, in passing, make one remark upon the course of proceeding which seems the most likely to lead to a rational conclusion on this important question. Since all Christians receive Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah whom the Jewish prophets predicted, it would appear a fair and unexceptionable method to collect all the characters and circumstances under which they represented the Messiah, and to compose our description of him from the whole of this antecedent evidence. We should then come the better prepared to the careful study of the New Testament, the writers of which were so thoroughly imbued with the information and sentiments of the ancient prophecies, that they evidently pre-suppose in their readers an acquaintance with "all that is written in Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning the Christ."

Such is the glorious Person who presented the great sacrifice, "who was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, but is over all, God blessed for ever."

II. The SUBJECT of the sacrifice, or that in which it properly consists, is expressed by the term "HIMSELF."

The Father of mercies hath provided this Lamb for a sacrifice. "God so loved the world, that HE GAVE his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but might have everlasting life." It was in obedience to this gracious will and appointment, that the Messiah devoted himself for us. "Therefore doth my Father love me," said our compassionate Redeemer, "because I lay down my life." So unjust is the calumny often cast upon our doctrine of atonement, as if we represented the benevolence of the Son to be superior to that of the Father! From this appointment, we may infer the propriety of the sacrifice of Christ, as a measure of the divine government, and its validity for all the purposes of divine mercy.

Our text affirms that Christ offered himself WITHOUT SPOT: a sacrifice, in every sense, pure, unblemished, and perfectly holy. On this circumstance the sacred writers lay particular stress; as, without it, the sacrifice would have been altogether in vain. Had Christ been personally a sinner, in any respect or degree, he would have been utterly disqualified to achieve the work of salvation; he would have needed for himself that blessing which he came to confer upon others. The Levitical law made men high priests that had

infirmity; but he was "holy, harmless, and undefiled. He needed not to offer, first for his own sins. He was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin. We are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."*

In those respects in which the sacrifice of the Messiah implied suffering, it could attach only to his human nature. The Divinity is not susceptible of pain or death. Inconsiderate language, seeming to imply the contrary to this, has done much harm to the cause of scriptural truth. All THAT, in the Redeemer of mankind, which was capable of suffering, did suffer: all that he possessed of finite and dependent nature. But it appears reasonable to consider all that he did in his capacity and offices as a Saviour, to have a character of worth and excellency, proportioned to the COMPLETE dignity of his person. Though only the pure and perfect human nature of the Messiah could suffer, it is obvious that all the acts and sufferings of that human nature, by reason of its union with the divine, come under a *relative consideration* very different from that which similar acts and sufferings could have in any *mere* man.—Analogies and illustrations from human dignities and affairs might easily be devised. But all such suppositions must, of necessity, be deeply defec-

* Ch. vii. 26, 27. 1 John iii. 5. 1 Pet. i. 19. Also, see Supplementary Note XVI.

tive. The transcendent case before us is absolutely *sui generis;* and all our reflections upon it should be conducted with the most cautious reverence, and with an anxious adherence to the light of revelation.

These observations lead to a further view of the subject.

III. The CIRCUMSTANCE which confers its proper value upon the sacrifice of Christ.

The value of this expiatory sacrifice is not to be estimated from the divine appointment alone; nor merely from the kind or intensity of sufferings which our blessed Saviour endured; but from HIS TRUE AND ESSENTIAL DEITY. This is that relative consideration, just mentioned, which confers ITS OWN dignity upon the constituted person of the Messiah, and upon his whole mediatorial work. It is the opinion of some eminent critics, and appears to me supported by probable evidence, that to this grand circumstance our text refers, in saying that Christ "THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered himself."*

On this holy ground I advance with trembling and anxiety, lest I should darken counsel by words without knowledge. Presumption, curiosity, and the affectation of knowledge beyond what revelation permits, — I solemnly disown.

* See Supplementary Note XVII.

Most sincerely do I reverence, and desire ever to obey, the just injunction of our unrivalled poet:

> Heaven is, for thee, too high
> To know what passes there: be lowly wise;
> Contented that thus far hath been revealed,
> Not of earth only, but of highest heaven.
>
> Par. Lost, viii. 173.

My aim only is to guard the truth from the assaults of its adversaries, and to show the solidity of its base, and the symmetry of its parts. That difficulties exist, I well know. They arise in all our attempts to gain accurate knowledge. The philosophy of nature teaches us to expect mysteries in the sublimer wisdom which cometh from above. A mystery, however, is not an absurdity. It is truth seen in disunited portions: but though the intermediate parts be hid in a wise or necessary darkness, their continuity, in the perfection of divine harmony, is not the less certain. The gospel is "the wisdom of God in a mystery:" and can we be, with reason, surprised that this capital part of the gospel, which we are humbly exploring, should be, in some of its bearings, to us unsearchable or dimly seen?

In my most serious estimation, and may I presume to say, after no careless or precipitate inquiry,—"the pillar and ground of truth, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness;"—it is "the LIVING GOD—who was manifested in

the flesh,"* and stamped his own glory upon the propitiation for our sins. *How* this effect was produced; *how* the Saviour's divine nature conveyed its own infinite value to the obedience and sufferings of "the flesh," the human nature;—it is no objection or difficulty with me, to believe that *mortals cannot know*. I should rather think it a presumption against any sentiment which respected the mode of the Deity's existence and agency, that it contained nothing but what was perfectly plain to our mental perception. But we may shew the reasonableness of a doctrine, and rebut the charges which rashness or profaneness may throw out against it, without overstepping the boundary prescribed to our feeble and fallen faculties. With deference, therefore, I submit to serious and candid minds some considerations, not, I trust, unauthorized by scripture and reason.

i. The assumption of human nature by the Eternal Word, who is God, was the act of an Infinite Mind, knowing, intending, and contemplating all the *results* of that act of assumption, through the period of the designed humiliation and for ever. To the Divine Mind, nearness and remoteness of time or space are equal. Consequently, as the actual assumption of human nature was the first result of the omnipotent will, so the

* See Supplementary Note XVIII.

same act, or volition, must equally have carried forwards and communicated its original divine value to all the subsequent moral and mediatorial acts of the incarnate Saviour.

ii. The union of the divine and human natures, in his person, was constant and invariable. The scriptures afford us no reason to think that the Messiah's human nature, though retaining always its essential properties, had ever a separate subsistence. To the mother of Jesus it was announced, "The Holy Being which is born of thee, shall be called the Son of God:" and according to the prophetic declaration, as soon as men could say, "Unto us a child is born," so soon was it the fact that his name was called "the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Mighty God." It was the Mediator, *in his whole person*, that acted for the salvation of man; though it was impossible that the Divine Nature could be subject to suffering.

From these two positions I infer a third, which I venture to propose, as an unexceptionable mode of stating this important, though profound and difficult subject:—

iii. All the acts of our Lord Jesus Christ that were physical, or merely intellectual, were acts of his human nature alone, being necessary to the subsistence of a human nature: but all his moral acts, and all the moral qualities of complex acts; or, in other terms, all that he did in and for the execution of his mediatorial office and work;—

were impressed with the essential dignity and moral value of his Divine Perfection.

These reasons appear to me sufficient to authorize our attributing to this holy sacrifice, a value *properly* INFINITE, on account of the Divine Nature of him who offered it. A most important conclusion! Rich in blessing to the contrite sinner: full of joy to the obedient believer.

I cannot decline, also, to observe here, how close and important is the connection between the two leading doctrines of the Christian system, the Deity and the Atonement of Christ. They yield mutual illustration and support; and neither can be consistently held without the other.*

PART III.

On the EFFICACY *of the Sacrifice of Christ.*

From the principles which have been stated, and, I trust, established by evidence, it is now easy to infer, that the Redeemer's sacrifice of HIMSELF possesses an efficacy truly divine, glorious to its All-wise and Gracious Author, and replete with boundless blessings to mankind.

I. Every obstruction is removed to the exer-

* See Supplementary Note XIX.

cise of pardoning and saving mercy, for every purpose, and in every way, that Infinite Wisdom and Goodness may see fit.

We have seen that there is evidence, from the word of inspiration and the reason of things, that sin deserves punishment, and that under the government of an All-perfect Being it must meet with its desert. The guilt of sin, therefore, so long as it remains, must separate the guilty soul from God. Nor could any repentance, prayers, works, or satisfactions of human devising, ever remove the dreadful barrier. But now this otherwise insuperable obstacle is removed, in a manner honourable to the justice and government of God, on the behalf of all who believe in Christ and obey him. To such he is the Author of eternal salvation; for he has "redeemed them from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them;" and, "having made peace through the blood of his cross, he hath reconciled those that were once alienated and enemies." He hath "not died in vain;" which the word of truth expressly declares would have been the case on the supposition that "righteousness," acceptance to the favour and never-dying friendship of God, "came by the law;" as the reward of personal obedience.* Infinitely different from any such supposition, is the true fountain of salvation to men. Now, the

* Gal. ii. 21.

streams of divine benevolence flow to unworthy mortals, in full harmony with all the honours of the divine law. Now, FREE GRACE is consistently and righteously exercised, in bestowing on the restored transgressor, a full and everlasting PARDON of all his crimes. He who is of purer eyes than to behold evil, is shewn to our admiring and grateful view, abundant in mercy, pardoning iniquity, transgression, and sin; a Just God and a Saviour; just and justifying him that believeth in Jesus.—Now, the active obedience of the Lord Christ is freely and graciously imputed to the pardoned sinner. He is clothed with the garments of salvation; he is covered with the robe of righteousnesss; he counts all things but loss, that he may win Christ, and be found in HIM, not having his own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.—Now the gift of the Holy Spirit, in all his gracious and saving influences, is freely poured out. "The Spirit is given, for Jesus is glorified;" to renew the soul in righteousness and true holiness, to train it to moral perfection, and to form and maintain that sacred UNION with the Redeemer which produces moral principles, sentiments and conduct resembling his, and which establishes the never-retracted communication of all the blessings of grace and glory.

II. A sure foundation is laid for the overtures

of reconciliation, and invitations of mercy, to mankind.

Here eternal and sovereign LOVE erects its throne, and proclaims, from this mercy-seat, the act of boundless grace. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners! Whom God hath set forth, a propitiation, through faith, by his blood; to the demonstration of his justice at the present time; so that HE is just and yet justifying the man who is of the faith of Jesus. Now is the accepted time: now is the day of salvation. Look unto me, and be saved, all ye ends of the earth. Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely!"

Under this gracious commission, the ministers of the gospel are authorized to preach repentance and remission of sins, in the name of Jesus, to every nation under heaven. The sacrifice of the Son of God is the chief article of our message, the sun of our system, the central orb to which all the lines of christian truth converge. A convincing proof of this, is that the New Testament designates the ministry of the gospel by terms expressive only of *this* doctrine; thus intimating that, while we are sedulously to declare the whole counsel of God, our choice and capital theme must be REDEMPTION BY THE BLOOD OF CHRIST. Such terms are "the preaching of the cross, the preaching of Christ crucified, glorying in his cross,

determining to make known nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified." We also, would tread in the steps of the inspired teachers; "preaching peace by Jesus Christ: he is Lord of all. We, then, are ambassadors for Christ; as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled unto God: for he hath made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

A controversy has been moved, whether we are to regard the sacrifice of the Redeemer as offered generally, on the behalf of mankind, or exclusively for those who shall in the event be saved by him. This subject appears to me to involve great difficulties on both sides; and, except treated with especial caution, it is peculiarly liable to become a vain and unprofitable question. If the inquiry be understood to be, Whether Christ died for any, so as to procure the pardon of their sins and freedom from condemnation, but omitting an effectual provision for the sincere and persevering sanctity of their hearts and lives: we answer without hesitation, that, in this sense, he died for none. If the question be, Whether any child of man, who is convinced of his sins, humbled, penitent, and contrite, may entertain a doubt of the efficacy of the atonement for himself, or the gracious readiness of the Almighty Saviour to receive him to

the enjoyment of all its benefits;—to this I boldly answer, that no such doubt can be entertained without a false and injurious reflection upon the veracity of the divine word. The doctrine of a sovereign, gracious, and personal election, I believe, to be clearly affirmed in the scriptures, and to be as clearly deducible by rational argument from the divine perfections. But this doctrine is totally misapprehended, if it be conceived to supersede the obligation to faith and obedience, or to limit the generous freeness with which sinners are invited to partake of the UNSEARCHABLE RICHES of Christ. There is, undoubtedly, a glorious coincidence and harmony among all the counsels and ways of God; and therefore the gracious decree of election and the designs of redemption must be in perfect unison. But whether the relation of the former to the latter, immediately regards the *original performance*, or the successive *application*, of the Saviour's mediatorial work, does not, I acknowledge, appear to me to be a question very necsssary or profitable, or that it is clearly solved in the divine oracles: and, where they are silent, it is our wisdom to remain so likewise. It is, also, deserving of particular attention, that the sacred writers never scruple to use large and general expressions when treating on the subject of redeeming grace; and that they employ the most unlimited phraseology, in the calls, commands, and invitations, by which they carry into

effect the commission of their Wise and Benignant Lord, who is "RICH in mercy unto all that call upon him."

III. This doctrine furnishes a solid assurance of preservation in holiness, and the final attainment of immortal happiness, to all who cordially accept the truth which it declares.

It is a very striking fact, which adds a weighty confirmation to all our other arguments, that the apostolic writings uniformly lay down the holiness, virtue, or morality of Christians as a system of duties and blessings, of which redemption by the blood of Christ is the antecedent *cause*, and a most forcible *obligation*. In the plainest and most uniform manner, they represent our personal obedience, not as the cause or condition of salvation, but as the primary and most essential part of salvation itself. "The love of Christ constraineth us, to live, not to ourselves, but to Him who died for us. He bore our sins in his own body, that we, being dead to sins, might live to righteousness." Thus, "redemption *from all iniquity*," is the object which the sacrifice of Christ attains. Such a redemption, personal and experimental as well as extrinsic and legal, is also the object of the most anxious desire in the breast of an awakened sinner. Emancipation from the curse would not meet his conscious wants, without the concurrent blessing of vital, prevailing, and active holiness. This end

the atoning sacrifice secures, not only by presenting the most probable inducements and assistances, but by an efficiency of ALMIGHTY INFLUENCE, which convinces and satisfies the understanding, persuades the heart, and determines the will. "How much more," says our text, "shall the blood of Christ—purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the Living God!" The continuance of this sanctifying agency is secured by the unchangeable value of the great sacrifice, and by the ever-living power and love of Him who offered it on earth, and is now "entered, with his own blood, into heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us;" our Patron, Advocate, and Intercessor. Because he lives, his saints shall live also. Under the conduct of his Holy Spirit their holy character shall grow and flourish, till it is ripened to the perfection of Heaven. He gives to them eternal life: and who shall separate them from the love of Christ?

This encouraging sentiment is strengthened by the relation which this doctrine has to the exercise of devotional communion with Heaven. Such intercourse of the soul with God is the essential and principal instrument of maintaining the spiritual life. Yet this happy intercourse is impossible, except by a sincere dependence upon the sacrifice of Christ. By him alone, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, can we approach the Father. The blood of sprinkling is the only protection that

will avail us before the Judge of all. But now "we have boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus;" and are assured that prayer and praise, perfumed with the fragrance of his atonement and intercession, will rise with acceptance before the spotless throne.

To that throne we must, in a short time, approach in another manner. We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. He cometh with clouds: and every eye shall see him. But none shall be able to stand in the day of his coming, except those who are "washed from their sins in his blood." To such only, will the tribunal of justice appear encircled with the rainbow of mercy; for he that sitteth upon it "is become unto them wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption."

This is the principal topic on which the preaching of Christianity should dwell. Like the sun in the heavens, it is the fountain of the light and life of religion, the energy, the fervour, and the joy of the Christian character. So the apostles of Christ considered it. The doctrine of a Saviour crucified was to them the wisdom and the power of God. Its truth, its value, and its efficacy, are the same still. Innumerable instances have existed and do exist of its unrivalled effect, in the conversion of the unbelieving, the prejudiced, and the profligate, to holiness of character, to active benevolence, to the best use of life, and to a tri-

umphant hope in death. You, my beloved brethren, students for the Christian ministry in our venerable seminary ;*—you have the strongest motives to hold this doctrine of the cross dear and precious. It is all your salvation and all your desire: and to announce its glad tidings to mankind is the choice and purpose of your lives. You participate in the pleasure afforded to me this day, of bearing a public testimony to this glorious theme. Ye are witnesses, and God also, that these are the sentiments which, privately and publicly are professed and maintained among us, not in the elucidation of their theory only, but with a studious regard to their influence on the heart and in the life. The affectionate belief and enjoyment of this doctrine will be found, in practice, to be the only means of preserving your hearts pure and happy, your lives holy, and your ministry useful: "for other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid; which is Jesus Christ." "Upon this rock," said the Faithful Witness, "I will build my church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Some carelessly disregard this grand truth, or professedly disbelieve it. But have they taken

* The Protestant Dissenting College at Homerton, consisting of two foundations, of which the one was established soon after the Revolution, and the other in 1730. To the Patrons and Students of that Institution, the substance of this Discourse was originally delivered on March 11, 1813.

care to understand what the doctrine really is? Have they attended to it with the serious diligence which it demands? Have they scrutinized its evidence and tendency, with impartiality and prayer, with a sense of their accountableness as creatures, and of their humiliating condition as sinners? "O that they were wise! that they understood this!" O that they would faithfully search into the motives of their inattention, the secret springs of their disbelief! Are there no criminal passions, no irreligious prejudices, which indispose them to the search? Is there no pride of fancied virtue, or of imagined superiority in discernment:—no unwillingness to concede the painful charge of sin and guilt and ruin, which this doctrine presupposes, and which the word of Heaven so plainly asserts;—no reluctance to admit that sin is that unutterable and flagitious evil, which, on these principles, it must be;—no secret dislike to those humiliating reflections, that entire self-renunciation, and those strict obligations to holiness, which MUST be felt by him who truly receives Christ as his wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption? —The day is coming which shall declare. Amidst the awful developements of that day, may our "faith be found unto praise and honour and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ!"

Let us not imagine, as many do, that these are only speculations, ingenious and perhaps just; but by no means essential to the existence of

religion now, or to the possession of happiness in the future state. The Sacrifice of Christ, and the doctrines associated with it, are not by us conceived as matters of mere theory, so that the opinionative belief in them is all that distinguishes the genuine Christian from the outwardly virtuous and moral man of the world. The case is essentially different. It is the INFLUENCE of the doctrines of Redemption upon our own inward sensibilities and affections, in relation to God and ourselves, that constitutes the value of a scriptural faith. That faith is a holy and active principle. Were it the inert belief of any doctrine whatsoever, we should lay no stress upon it, except that which arises from the rational pleasure of knowing the truth. But we are persuaded that the state of *mind* and *motive*, upon which depends all the moral value of outward actions, is both the necessary and the exclusive product of that faith. Without it, we have no just appreciation of the moral attributes of God, no sense of the excellence of his law, no right feeling of the rectitude and beauty of obedience, or of the intrinsic deformity of sin, no repentance but that which is the constrained result of selfish fear, no vital piety, no acceptable devotion, no holy gratitude, no Christ-like benevolence, no generous and delightful charity, no solid virtue, no consistent and comprehensive morality, no "purifying of the conscience from dead works to serve the LIVING GOD."

DISCOURSE II.

ON THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

In the preceding Discourse, many particulars concerning this most momentous office and work of our Divine Redeemer, are expressly stated or less formally adverted to: but a more minute investigation, in the form of a methodical synopsis, may be useful, to place the doctrine and illustrations contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews more clearly before the reader's mind.

The articles of this enumeration will fall into two classes: the first comprising the APPELLATIVES given to our Blessed Saviour with respect to his Priesthood; and the second consisting of the DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERS which are applied to the office itself and to his discharge of it.

I. Terms and appellations designating the *personal condition*, and *character* of Christ, in relation to this office.

i. *Priest*, ἱερεύς. Our English word, like the

corresponding one in the languages of several of our neighbouring nations, is a corruption of the New Testament term *Presbyter*, the meaning of which is essentially different from that which was intended by the ancient terms. The ἱερεὺς (ὁ ἱερὰ ῥέζων) of the Greeks, and the *sacerdos* (*à sacris faciundis*) of the Latins, plainly correspond to the definition given in the Discourse. But it is less easy to determine the primitive meaning of the name כהן *Cohen*, for the radical verb is not found in what remains of the Hebrew language. The question is of considerable importance; for a knowledge of the original and definite application, of either the verb or the participial appellative would bring us to an acquaintance with the ideas which were attached to the function thus expressed, by the persons who received the earliest revelations. The inquiry cannot be pursued without some aid from the Arabic dialect. Yet the employment of cognate languages, for the illustration of particular words, is a work that requires more sagacity and caution than seem to have been thought necessary by some learned illustrators of the Old Testament from Arabic forms and significations. Though the primary notion, in a given case, may be the same; yet the accessory ideas, at an equal point of progression from the stem, will often be, in two branches or dialects, not merely different but even opposite. Kimchi regards the primary meaning of the Hebrew word to be *the rendering*

of honourable and dignified service, such as that of the officers of state to their sovereign: in which he is followed by some of the highest oriental scholars, our own distinguished and hapless Castell, Giggeius, Ernesti, Simonis, J. D. Michaelis probably, Tittmann, and Eichhorn. By Cocceius the idea was laid down of *drawing near*, as to a king or any supreme authority; and this was adopted by the elder Schultens, the father of the most solid and rational study of Hebrew literature. From this, the former meaning might be fairly deduced. Clodius (*Lexic. Vocum Hebr. Rariorum et Obscurarum,*) and Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lexica Hebr.*) mention, from the Arabic, the notion of *discovering secret things, foretelling, having occult knowledge;* and this is zealously supported by Gesenius, the rival of Eichhorn, and whose reputation as a Hebrew critic stands at the highest point. The article in his Lexicon is so important, and it is so much abridged in Mr. Leo's recently published Translation, that I shall be excused for extracting the principal parts of it.

"The verb, in its primitive form, does not occur in Hebrew. In Arabic, it denotes *to prophesy, to foretell as a soothsayer;* and, among the heathen Arabs, the substantive bore the latter signification; also that of a *mediator*, a *middle person* who interposes in any business; which seems to be the radical meaning, as prophets and priests were

regarded as mediators between men and the Deity. In the Syriac dialect, the words signify *the enjoyment of riches, affluence, grandeur, splendor.*

"In Hebrew, the verb occurs only in the conjugation Pihel, in three senses. (1.) *To be,* or *become a priest.* Deut. x. 6. In the earliest families of the race of Shem, the offices of priest and prophet were undoubtedly united, so that the word originally denoted both, and at last the Hebrew idiom kept one part of the idea and the Arabic the other. (2.) *To serve as a priest, to discharge the duties of the priestly office.* Ex. xxxi. 10. xxviii. 41. xl. 13, 15. Hos. iv. 6. (3.) Following the Syriac idiom, in Is. lxi. 10. 'as the bridegroom adorneth himself with a turban.'"—In what Gesenius says upon the substantive, is nothing that needs to be cited at length. He observes, that, in some passages (as Gen. xli. 45. Ps. cx. 4.) the Chaldee Targum translates the word by a term that denotes *prince* or *chieftain:* and he calls attention to the fact that the sons of David (2 Sam. viii. 18. comp. 1 Chron. xviii. 17.) and other persons (1 Kings iv. 5. 2 Kings x. 11.) are styled *priests,* when they could not be properly so, but were so denominated as being *counsellors of the crown,* more particularly perhaps in ecclesiastical affairs. *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch.* Leipz. 1823, p. 343.

All these ideas might naturally proceed from

that of *agent* or *mediator* between parties, as laid down by Gesenius. Aristotle describes a priest as (τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος) "presiding over things relating to the gods." The apostolic definition meets every point and clearly agrees with the philological evidence: "Every high-priest taken from among men is constituted, on the behalf of men, with respect to their concerns with God, that he may present both gifts and sacrifices for sins." Heb. v. 1.

"Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec." v. 6. vii. 17, 21; 11, 15. "For if indeed he were on earth, he would not be a Priest, since there are" &c. viii. 4. That is, 'if I represented him as an earthly or common priest, it would not be proper to call him a priest at all; for, on the one hand, there are priests of this kind to whose class he could not legally belong; and their priesthood is only a faint shadow, a mere figure and symbol of his; and, on the other hand, his work and office refer to substantial and infinite blessings, spiritual and heavenly.' This interpretation is supported by Calvin, Michaelis, Ernesti, Heinrichs, and Dindorf.

"A great Priest over the house of God." x. 21. The church or collective people of God, comprehending all its genuine members in both the present and the future life, is represented under the figure of a *temple* (as in Eph. ii. 21. 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 5.) and as the Israelitish high priest was

the chief personage in the temple at Jerusalem, so is Jesus the Messiah in this spiritual and immortal constitution.

ii. *High Priest*, ἀρχιερεύς. "— a merciful and faithful High Priest, with respect to our concerns with God, in order to make propitiation for the sins of the people." ii. 17. Tender and compassionate from his own experience of sorrows, and discharging his office with equal fidelity in supporting the honour of God (John xvii. 4.) and in procuring benefits for all who put their confidence in him.

"The High Priest of our confession;" iii. 1. *i. e.* whom we acknowledge, and to whom we profess our public adherence. But ὁμολογία signifies also an *agreement, bond of union,* or *covenant;* and some very great authorities, among whom are Wesseling, Ernesti, Morus, Heinrichs, and Tittmann, adopt this idea; and explain the clause, the High Priest who hath fulfilled the covenant on our behalf. But the use of the word, in all the other places of the New Testament, where it occurs (ch. iv. 14. x. 23. 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13. 2 Cor. ix. 13.) is a weighty though not necessarily decisive reason in favour of the other interpretation.

"A great High Priest who is passed into the heavens." iv. 14. Under the Jewish law, there were many high priests in succession, and many who degraded the office by the feebleness and

worthlessness of their characters: but the epithet "great" represents the Christian High Priest as supreme in dignity and every excellence; singular, sole, and unrivalled; having no equal, partner, or successor in his office. Aaron and each of his successors passed through all the precincts and courts of the earthly sanctuary, till he arrived at his solitary and awful station; and there, accompanied by no mortal, with light such as rendered but darkly visible the ark of the covenant, the golden mercy-seat, and the cherubim of glory, he sprinkled the blood of typical expiation, presented the incense, and prayed for his nation. But the Messiah, "having offered his own blood, by which a real and not an emblematical atonement was made, entered into the true holy of holies, which is in heaven."* As a real and not an emblematical High Priest, with an expiation and a righteousness not figurative but of infinite worth in the eyes of eternal holiness, he enters the heavenly world, he takes his seat of authority, he displays it to us as "the throne of grace," he invites our devout approach, and he insures to us the greatest blessings.

"Not such a High Priest as could not sympathize with our weaknesses." iv. 15. Though our Blessed Lord could have no experience of the

* The words of *Dr. Priestley*, on Heb. ix. 12. in his posthumous *Notes on Scripture*.

disposition or perpetration of sin, of its defilement or personal guilt; yet he had the deepest share in the miseries induced by it. He feels therefore the most generous commiseration in the sorrows and sufferings of his faithful people, notwithstanding those sinful infirmities which they sincerely lament and resist; and his sympathy is not barren pity, but it is always active to the administration of "mercy and grace for help in the time of need."

"Christ did not assume to himself the honour of becoming High Priest." v. 5. The Lord Jesus always ascribed his mission, his particular acts and proceedings, his doctrine, and his entire authority as the Messiah, to the express will and appointment of his Divine Father. *e. g.* John v. 19, 26, 27, 43. vi. 38. vii. 28. viii. 54. x. 18. But that mission is here declared to involve the acts and function of the supreme priesthood.

"Declared by God, High Priest, according to the order of Melchisedec." v. 10. I subjoin Michaelis's Paraphrase of the whole passage, v. 7—10. "This office he has actually fulfilled in the manner already described. He has himself experienced our distress and dread at the approach of death; that hereafter, at the aspect of it, a peculiar sympathy might arise in him. For in the days in which he walked on earth, encompassed with a weak and dying body, he made supplication, in lowly prayer, with vehement crying and

tears, to God who could deliver him from death. God heard his prayer and freed him from the distress at which he had trembled, or (to make use of an expression of a Psalm which treats of him,) he 'heard him from his fear' [Ps. xxii. 22.] It might appear that, as the Son of God, as the Messiah, he might have required exemption from the labours and sorrows of human life; but he condescended to them, that he might learn through suffering a new kind of obedience, the practice of which peculiarly belongs to us sinners. When he had endured this painful consecration to the priesthood, and had offered his first but only sacrifice, he became, to all those who on their part are obedient to him, the cause of everlasting salvation, and obtained from God the name of a Priest of the order of Melchisedec." *Erklärung des Briefes a. d. Hebr.* p. 175.

I would suggest to the reflection of my reader, that the idea upon which this somewhat eccentric and at times seemingly irreverent writer, but who is often profoundly and happily sagacious, lays great stress, *the manner in which Christ could learn obedience,* is of great importance. The eternal Son of God is, notwithstanding his divine nature, subordinate in the order of Deity, and ever perfectly obedient to the Father. To have been thus *subject to the Father*, from all eternity and by the necessity of the divine personality, is no more

incongruous with the proper and essential divinity of the Son, than it will be, after the consummation of the present system of things, when the great parenthesis of the mediatorial administration shall be completed, and "God shall be all in all." Also, as Messiah, in an assumed nature, and as the servant and messenger of God, he owed all the obedience that was compatible to the state of a perfectly holy person. But that specific kind of obedience which consists in resigning one's self to suffering *expressly as the punishment of sin*, is no part of the original and necessary obligation lying upon any sinless being; it belongs naturally and properly, to none but sinners. That Christ, "who knew no sin, but was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," did in fact submit to *this kind* of obedience, is an invincible proof that he stood in a new relation, not properly his own, but assumed; that, in plain terms, "he bore our sins, he was wounded for our transgressions, he was made a sin-offering for us, he was made a curse for us." In this astonishing way it was that he was *made perfect* (τελειωθεὶς, *borne onwards to the end, completed*, every thing having been done that the case required,) in his capacity of being a Saviour. The apostle has expressed the same idea before; "the Author of salvation was to be made perfect through sufferings:" ii. 10. and, with the further respect to the glorified state of Christ, he is de-

clared to be (τετελειωμένος) *made perfect for ever*, a complete Saviour, besides whom and after whom there can be no other. vii. 28.

"Made a High Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec." vi. 20. Explained in the preceding Discourse, page 22.

"Such a High Priest was necessary for us, holy, guiltless, spotless, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." vii. 26. Πρέπει, in the New Testament style, denotes a *moral necessity*, between which, indeed, and *propriety* there is no difference but in degree. See ii. 10. Matt. iii. 15. Eph. v. 3. 1 Tim. ii. 10. Tit. ii. 1. In the Hebrew style, and in perfect agreement with the propriety of things, "the heavens" denoted the noblest parts of creation, all that is more glorious than the earth and its inhabitants. The last article, therefore, of the description presents to us the Lord Jesus, besides his perfect moral excellence, as exalted in his capacity of High Priest, for the purpose of effectuating salvation, so as to be higher than the highest of the works of God. Compare i. 4. Eph. i. 21. 1 Pet. iii. 22.

"The great point, in relation to the things which we have been treating, is this, that we have such a High Priest, who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.—" viii. 1. Κεφάλαιον may signify a *summary* or brief recapitulation, as it is taken in the

common version and in some others. But its more proper meaning is *the chief part* of a subject, what Suidas, in reference to this very passage, calls τὸ μέγιστον, *the greatest thing*. It is so interpreted here by De Sacy, Heinrichs, Michaelis, Dindorf, and Leander Van Ess; and with evident propriety, for the subsequent part of the discussion, which reaches to the end of chapter x., is by no means a summary of what had gone before, for it enters upon much new matter, and expands into various applications not before touched upon: but the single sentence thus introduced is an aphorism, presenting the great topic in a clear and detached form. The "throne of the Majesty in the heavens" is evidently intended to designate the *state* (from which the Scriptures do not warrant our excluding a refined and exalted idea of *locality*) in which the Being and Perfections of God are manifested in the most complete manner that created minds are capable of receiving. See i. 3. The phrase, *to sit at the right hand* is most probably used in reference to Ps. cx. 1. "It is derived," says Michaelis, "from the seat of God in the most holy place over the ark of the covenant, in relation to which [symbol] only can a right and left hand be ascribed to HIM who filleth all things. No mortal dared to venture upon entering the most holy place, except the high priest alone, who, once in every year, not without apprehension of death

(for death would be the consequence of the slightest oversight in performing the ceremonies,) and with the blood of expiation, entered into this terrible and sacred darkness. To sit down at all in the most holy place would have been a rashness and insult unheard of: but for a person to place his seat close to the cherubim, at the right hand of the invisible God who dwelt above them, would have been strictly equivalent to *declaring himself God, and requiring to be adored as God:* for every prayer of the Israelites was addressed, without any other visible object, to the most holy place, and indeed to the Deity who held [symbolically] his invisible throne at the western end of the sanctuary. When therefore Jehovah says to "the Lord," the King and Priest of the race of David, "Sit thou at my right hand;" it is, in the highest sense, equivalent to saying, "Enjoy with me divine honour and adoration: be the object of all the religious service of my people." But still further, from the next clause, "until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (*i. e.* till the time when thou shalt again come forth out of the most holy place, and wilt have beneath thy feet, instead of the ark of the covenant, the field of battle covered with thy prostrate enemies,) it appears to be intimated that, in like manner as the most holy place was inaccessible to men, and concealed entirely from their eyes, so the Messiah shall be withdrawn from the sight of his enemies.

This final circumstance has been accomplished by the ascension of Christ into the heavenly state, by which he entered into the true most holy place, the peculiar presence of God, where no mortal eye can pierce to view him, where no enemy can reach to injure him." *Anmerk. zu Ps.* cx. 1.

"Christ becoming present [with us], a High Priest of future blessings." ix. 11. The Levitical priesthood and its services (described in v. 1—10.) respected only temporal advantages, remissions, and purifications, with regard to factitious disabilities, bodily, ceremonial, and political: they had no intrinsic value, and were not efficient of moral benefits extending to man's eternal state, except so far as their symbolical design was apprehended and faithfully applied. But, in contrast with these, the Messiah, by the sacrifice and offering of himself, procures and bestows blessings which are not symbolical and subsidiary, but *real*, not stopping short in outward observances, but directly occupying and exercising the *internal faculties* of the mind, consisting not in civil qualifications and immunities, but in the actual *pardon* of sin, the gracious *favour* of the Infinite Judge, and a *conformity* of the moral feelings and active principles to his approving will; in a word, referring not to the present state as their scene of chief enjoyment, but to our *future and everlasting* existence.

iii. "The *Apostle*," ἀπόστολος, better translated *Messenger*, iii. 1. It was essential to the character of the Messiah, that he should be expressly commissioned and *sent* by God, as Moses was (Ex. iii. 14.) and all the true prophets: Jer. v. 25. This qualification Jesus frequently, and in the strongest manner asserts to himself: e. g. John iii. 34. viii. 42. xvii. 8, 18, 21, &c. In a distinguished prophecy concerning him, under this description, and where he is called "the Messenger of the covenant," (*i. e.* sent in pursuance of a covenant or gracious promise of God,) a special intention of his office is laid down to be "purifying the sons of Levi." Mal. iii. 1—3. The image being that of refining metals in the furnace, and the intention being declared to be kind and gracious, we cannot apply this feature of the prediction to the destroying judgments which fell upon the Jewish nation and its extremely corrupted priesthood, by the Roman invasion. The rational interpretation appears to be, that the Messiah would purify or retrieve from abuse the Levitical institution, by fulfilling its *great moral design;* and of this the sacrificial rite was the chief part: thus corresponding to the sense of this passage in the Epistle, and connecting the *mission* of Christ with his *high priesthood.*

iv. "*Minister of the sanctuary*," Λειτουργὸς τῶν ἁγίων. Public officer of the holy place, or of the

holy things, viii. 2. The proper Latin sense of *minister*, an attendant or servant, is quite inapplicable. Ernesti, whose exquisite taste in Latinity has been universally celebrated, proposes to render the phrase *Antistes sacrorum*. Michaelis, conceiving that the proper German word for minister would have a diminishing effect, and that the meaning of the apostle is the same as if he had used the term *Priest*, has taken that word both in his Paraphrase (*Erklärung* 1762,) and in his Translation and Notes in 1791 the year of his death. The design of the description plainly is to lead our minds to conceive of the Lord Jesus as *presiding over* the universal worship of the church, both on earth and in the glorified state; directing it by his authority, rendering it acceptable by his merit, and presenting it by his intercession.

v. "*The Lord*," by whom "the great salvation was spoken to us," and who now "delivers the divine oracles to us (χρηματίζων) from Heaven." ii. 3. xii. 25. With respect to the latter verse, it is observable that the person "who spake on earth" is the same who "now speaks from heaven;" for it is immediately added, "whose voice then shook the earth," the relative not admitting of any other antecedent. "The opposition expressed is not between the persons speaking, but between earth and heaven." *Owen*. "Hence it appears that the law was given by the Son of God." *Ernesti*.

" It is very clear that the giving of the law is here ascribed to Christ.—This manifestly belongs to his Divine Nature; and I cannot comprehend how any person whatsoever, who believes the Gospel of John, can find any difficulty in asssigning to the Divine Nature of Christ a participation in the giving of the law." *Michaelis Erklär.* Our Blessed Lord is further represented as "*now* speaking from heaven" to Christians generally; of course (if even we were, though no just reason could be given for it, to confine the reference to the persons to whom the Epistle was written, and their contemporaries,) to multitudes who never saw or heard him in the days of his flesh. This could be only by the agency of inspired men, whose commission to teach and command "in the name of Christ" was proved by miracles; and those miracles *they attributed* to HIM. Thus Christ stands in the very position of power, authority, and action, continually ascribed to Jehovah in the Old Testament, *speaking by his prophets.* This, observes Michaelis, is "saying of Christ the greatest thing that can be said."—*Anmerk.*

vi. *He who makes men fit to be presented to God,* ὁ ἁγιάζων. "He who sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one [father]; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." ii. 11. The term *sanctifying* here evidently requires to be taken in a large sense, as it corresponds to the

bringing many sons to glory through the death and sufferings of the Prince of salvation, just before stated. Michaelis has a very just and valuable remark, in both his early and his dying Commentaries upon this book: namely, that the sense of ἁγιάζειν, in this Epistle, usually is that which the corresponding Hebrew words bear in the Levitical laws, namely, to restore to a capacity of drawing near to God, in the instituted acts of worship, persons who had been excluded on account of any disqualification. Accordingly, in his *Erklärung*, he paraphrases the verse thus: "For he who acquires for them the liberty of access to God, and they for whom it is acquired, cannot but have one and the same way to glory; since they are children of one common Father, even Abraham: therefore, he is not ashamed to call them brothers." And, in his version, he expresses it; "For the Expiator and the expiated all descend from one ancestor."

vii. From the same passage, we draw another interesting view of the relation of Christ to the objects of his redeeming mercy: he is their *brother*, of one race with them, a partaker of flesh and blood in like manner with the children of men. This participation is spoken of as an act of *condescension*, and its design is expressed to be *deliverance* from the greatest evils. The former is not my present subject: but let it be allowed me in passing, to ask whether, on the supposition

that the Messiah was merely a human being, it could ever have been said of him that he "was not ashamed" to acknowledge his fellow-men to be his *brethren*. Could higher folly and arrogance be imagined, than that a man should speak, or feel, or act, so as to justify such an expression? Yet it is a part of the apostle's encomium upon his Lord and Master! Admit that he had a nature superior and really divine, and there is the strictest propriety in the expression: but on any lower hypothesis, even that of the highest Arianism, I do not see how it could be reconciled with wisdom, modesty, and truth. It appears self-evident that, not only the most virtuous man, but even the loftiest of any superior created intel ligences, would esteem it an honour to be called a brother of mankind; considering the capacities of human nature, and the high degrees of intellectual and moral excellence to which many of the human race have arisen.—The other observation refers to the *design* of this participation of human nature. This design is expressed, in the connected parts of the statement (v. 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17;) to be the *suffering of death*, as an effect of singular grace, for every man; *deliverance* from the bondage and dread of death, and something more terrible than mere mortality; *propitiation* for sins; the *bestowment* of salvation; the conducting to the *glory* of immortal purity and blessedness; the securing, by this wondrous inter-

vention, of "the things pertaining to God," in their amplitude of reference to all the designs of his wisdom and goodness, and to the eternal interests of mankind.

viii. "*Surety* (ἔγγυος) of a better covenant." vii. 22. The gospel-covenant is here stated to be superior to the Levitical, in proportion as the dignity of a divine oath confirmed its perpetuity, and consequently proved the higher description of its blessings. The appellation presents Christ to us as pledging himself for the fulfilment of the stipulations, on both sides; for God the righteous Judge, to man the supplicant for mercy; and for man the repenting and believing sinner, to God the Giver of divine good. This leads to the ideas which have been submitted upon the signification of the word *Priest*, as denoting one who transacts, intermediately, the infinite concerns of men in relation to their Almighty Ruler: and it corresponds also with the term next to be illustrated.

ix. "*Mediator* (μεσίτης) of a better covenant." viii. 6. The preceding clause in this sentence, "he hath obtained a more excellent λειτουργία," confirms the identity of purport between this appellation and λειτουργὸς, *Minister:* and it is manifestly of the same sense and design as *Surety*. The superiority of the gospel-dispensation is here alleged with respect to the nature and objects of its *promises*. Those of the Mosaic economy respected length of life, a numerous and prosperous

population, a fertile land, favourable seasons, successful industry, superiority to enemies, and other temporal advantages: as this subject is well illustrated by the late Dr. Erskine in his *Dissertation on the Sinai Covenant*, in which he separates the most valuable principles of Bishop Warburton's *Divine Legation of Moses*, from the mass of extraneous and objectionable matter. But the blessings of which the Messiah is the immediate Procurer and Bestower, refer to the holiness of the soul, and to its immortal interests. The primary meaning, then, of μεσίτης and ἔγγυος might be expressed, as Ernesti and others have remarked, by the Roman law-terms, *Interpres*, *Sequester*, *Fidejussor*, *Internuncius*. See his *Clavis Ciceroniana*, and his *Lectiones Academicæ in Ep. ad Hebr.* p. 692; and *Tittmanni Opuscula Theologica*, p. 225. Thus we find in Tertullian, "Caro [*sc.* fidelium] in deposito est ubicunque apud Deum, per fidelissimum sequestrem Dei et hominum Jesum Christum, qui et homini Deum et hominem Deo reddet." *De Resurrect.* cap. lxiii.

Μεσίτης is used by the Septuagint translator of the book of Job (whose skill and judgment were far superior to those of most of the other authors of that version) evidently to *complete* his expression of the sense of מוכיח, in ch. ix. 33. "There is between us no *arguer* [who might fully represent the cause, and state and arbitrate fairly for each party,] who can lay his hand upon us both." A

striking declaration, illustrating the most ancient ideas of the capacity and agency of a mediator.

An important passage in the predictions of Jeremiah exhibits the character and work of a Mediator: and this passage is the more necessary to be brought into light, as our generally excellent and judicious translators have totally eclipsed it, by following the confused Septuagint * in rendering the principal term as if it were plural, contrary to both the grammar and the connexion of the sentence. The connexion depicts the holiness and blessedness of the gospel-dispensation, according to the usual manner of the prophets, by a series of transitions from the circumstances of the return from Babylon, and the prosperity of the Jews under their native princes. Hence some have supposed the passage to be a prophetic description of the patriotic and zealous Maccabæan, or more properly called Asmonæan, family, and in particular of John Hyrcanus, the first independent prince of Judæa, and of whom Josephus says that he was "honoured by God with the three greatest dignities, political dominion, the

* The prophets in general, excepting Ezekiel and Amos, have been translated by the persons who made this ancient Greek version, with extraordinary carelessness and apparent ignorance of Hebrew; and, in addition to these original defects, the lamentable altering of the LXX. by Origen or his followers, under the notion of amending it, has probably made the obscurity deeper.

high-priesthood, and the gift of prophecy."* If this application be regarded as the mind of the Holy Spirit, the description will still fully avail for assisting our conceptions of a Mediator. But the connexion carried on to chap. xxxi. 1, and especially the peculiar sanctity of the character depicted, appear to be reasons of weight sufficient to determine the application to the Messiah. Hyrcanus was a great and probably a good man: but he was a military conqueror, he reigned by force of arms over vanquished and tributary nations, his kingdom was one of this world; the prophetic character he did not assume, and the grounds on which Josephus ascribes it to him are very insufficient. At least, the ultimate and perfect fulfilment of the prophecy far better suits the spiritual mediation and character of the Divine Redeemer, than those of any earthly deliverer. The passage is this; "And their PRINCE shall be from themselves [*i. e.* independent on any earthly auxiliaries,] and their RULER shall proceed from the midst of themselves: and I will bring him near, and he shall approach unto me: for Who is this that hath pledged his heart to approach unto me, saith Jehovah: and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God." Jer. xxx.

* Τριῶν τῶν μεγίστων ἄξιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριθεὶς, ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἔθνους, καὶ τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς τιμῆς, καὶ προφητείας. *Josephi Antiq. Jud.* XIII. x. 7.

21, 22.* The grounds of application to the Messiah are thus briefly stated by Dr. Seiler: "The greatest of all the princes that have sprung out of Israel, and to whom especially this passage has respect, is our adorable King and Lord Jesus Christ. He it is, who with entire heart has drawn near to God. He, as the eternal High-Priest hath entered into the most holy place, the presence of God, to make reconciliation for both Gentiles and Jews. He hath perfectly assured us of the favour of the Most High. Through faith in him, we become children of God; and the great promise is fulfilled to us, 'Ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.'"†

Here, then, we find a true and efficient Mediator depicted as possessing a previous and independent right, as one in union of nature with

* The new translation of Jeremiah by Dr. Dahler, Professor of Exegetical Theology in the Protestant Seminary at Strasburg, gives the passage thus:

"Leur chef sera pris de leur sein,
Et leur prince sortira de leurs rangs.
Je le ferai approcher, et il viendra vers moi.
Car qui est-ce qui oserait s'approcher de moi,
[Sans que je l'aie appélé]? dit l'Eternel."

Jérémie; traduit sur le Texte Original, &c. Strasb. 1825.

† *Grössre Biblische Erbauungsbuch*, vol. vii. p. 408. Erlangen, 1792. See also, an excellent elucidation of this text in the posthumous *Pastoral Memorials* of the late admirable divine, DR. RYLAND, entitled *The Reasonableness of Christ's Mediation;* 1826.

those whom he is seeking to bless, as pledging himself to the fulfilment of his work, as approaching the awful presence of the Deity, the Holy Judge of men, on their behalf, as approved and accepted by God, and as returning to mortals with the most gracious and all-comprehending promise of the new covenant.

It might seem an unbecoming omission not to notice another important passage, which evidently claims a principal consideration in any attempt to ascertain the scripture doctrine of a Mediator: Gal. iii. 20. "Now a Mediator is not of one: but God is one." In attempting to elucidate a passage which is, by some eminent critics, called the most difficult in the Bible, I may hope for candid indulgence.

It appears plain that the intention of the paragraph, v. 17—24, is to shew that the Mosaic law was not inconsistent with the gospel of Christ, but, on the contrary, was in harmony with the principles of the gospel, and entirely subservient to its design. I conceive that the article does not refer to the object of μεσίτης in the sentence immediately preceding, but is employed for anticipative reference (see Cardinal Bessarion, in *Budæi Comment. Ling. Gr.* col. 1552 and 1554, ed. Basil. 1557. and *Bishop Middleton on the Greek Article,* p. 57.) so as to denote any one who acts as a mediator. It also appears reasonable to allow—that ἑνὸς and εἷς must, unless we violate the common rules of language,

be taken in the same signification, though their application be different;—that the genitive should be understood with its own natural force to denote *property* or *possession*;—and that the most fair and unforced supplement is some word signifying *party*, which Sir Norton Knatchbull says is actually supplied in the Æthiopic version. If those points be admitted, the whole passage may be interpreted thus:

"(V. 19.) In the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, an intervening agent between God and the people was employed, namely Moses. (v. 20.) But such an intervening agent does not belong to any single party. Had the revelation made on Sinai been a promulgation of simple law, there could have been no such interposer; for in the declaration of authoritative commands, the superior person acts a part purely sovereign. He issues his mandate, and he expects unqualified obedience. Had, therefore, the declaration from Sinai been such, God would have given it immediately from himself. But, on that occasion, he was pleased to act as ONE of two parties treating with each other. (See Deut. v. 5, 23, 27, 28.) So that the employment of Moses in this service of intervention between Jehovah and the Hebrew nation, was a kind condescension to the distress and the fears of the people, was an act of special grace, and was an intimation of still greater mercy to be shewn to sinners. (v. 21—24.) There-

fore the Law of Sinai is not contradictory to the design of the Gospel: for, though it could not give pardon and spiritual blessedness, it was admirably adapted to serve as a preparatory arrangement for the introduction and illustration of that glorious and effective grace which shines in the gospel of Christ."

Among the almost incredible multitude of explications which have been proposed, of this passage, a very remarkable one was published at Erfurt, in 1821, in a Dissertation of 161 pages, intitled, Ἐνὸς, *in nobilissimo Pauli ad Gal.* iii. 20. *Effato, haud Genitivo sed Nominativo Casu esse positum, examinatis aliorum* ccxliii. *Interpretum Explicationibus; &c. Auctore G. H. F. Weigand.* My knowledge of this Dissertation is derived from an article in the *Révue Encyclopédique* for September, 1825, and which I believe may be attributed to the estimable Mr. Gœpp, one of the Pastors of the Lutheran Church at Paris. It appears that, supported by a mass of Greek learning, Mr. Weigand considers ἑνὸς as a rare substantive, used to signify the Jewish high-priest when performing the annual service of the great expiation. So far as, from the brief article, I can divine his interpretation, it seems to be to this effect; "He who can act as a real and efficient mediator between sinners and God, is not the Levitical high-priest, even when exercising his highest function of a typical expiation: it is God,

in the person of the Messiah, who alone can so act."

The passage, Heb. ix. 15—17, lies under a difficulty which interpreters and commentators have felt to be very heavy. The word used by the apostle, διαθήκη, signifies generally any kind of contract, agreement, or prescribed arrangement: and therefore it is applied by common Greek writers, not only to covenants of any kind, but also to *testamentary* dispositions. It is an ancient opinion that, in this latter acceptation the apostle uses it in the passage before us, quitting abruptly the former sense in which he had always before applied it, but returning to that sense immediately after, and never again departing from it. Such a way of dealing with language cannot but appear very extraordinary, and nothing but inextricable necessity could justify us in imputing it to any good writer. Such a necessity is, however, supposed to exist in this case; and is deduced solely from the remaining terms in the passage, which are thought impossible to be applied to any other object than a will rendered valid by the death of a testator. Chrysostom affirms that the apostle ingeniously availed himself of the double sense of the word, in order to meet the objection of weak persons, who might think that the *death* of the Founder of Christianity was a very inauspicious circumstance, going near to the exploding of his claims: the apostle therefore

maintains that the matter was quite the reverse, for that the constitution of the gospel might be viewed as a will, which brings a beneficiary interest to legatees only by the death of the person who had made it. *Chrysost. Homil. XVI. in Ep. ad Hebr.*

The objections to this, though it is the common interpretation, and is supported by some very excellent authorities, are obvious. It is attributing to the apostle the imposing of a new sense upon a word in the very current of discourse, without notice and to be quitted immediately after; that sense, though habitual in classical Greek, has not a single example besides in the Hebraized Greek of the Septuagint or the New Testament; the argument would require that the Levitical dispensation should be called "the first testament," though it had nothing in it of a testamentary nature; it would necessitate the rendering of v. 20, "the blood of the testament," an expression either unintelligible or involving inadmissible consequences, as it would attribute death to the Divine Majesty. For these or similar reasons, some eminent scholars have relinquished the entire interpretation, and conceive that there is no necessity for deserting the ordinary Scripture sense of διαθήκη. Among these, Peirce, Doddridge, Michaelis, and Macknight, may be specified as the chief: Whitby also inclines strongly to it. On the other hand, their method

of understanding the words is pressed by the necessity of making ὁ διαθέμενος and νεκροὶ to signify the animal sacrifices by which the most solemn covenants in early times were ratified: whereas the phrase διαθέσθαι διαθήκην is common in the Septuagint, and always refers to the act of the person who constitutes the covenant; and νεκροὶ or νεκρὰ is never applied to the dead bodies of any but mankind. Michaelis acknowledges that he can meet these objections in no other way than, as he held the hypothesis of a Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic original of this Epistle, by supposing that the Greek translator had here fallen into some mistake. Peirce, Newcome, Macknight, and the late Mr. Archibald Maclean (a sagacious and judicious commentator) adopt different modes of removing the former difficulty: of the latter they seem not to have been sensible. Michaelis and Mr. Greville Ewing, in his excellent Greek Lexicon, conceive that ὁ διαθέμενος is equivalent to μεσίτης just before, and that Christ is expressly intended; but it appears insuperably difficult to give to the attributive a particular relation in a general proposition. Perhaps we must humbly say that this passage is among the "things hard to be understood" of the apostle Paul's writings, and that the satisfactory elucidation of it is not yet attained. I conceive, therefore, that I cannot better serve my readers than by giving a close translation of Michaelis's Paraphrase, published

in 1762, and of his Version published a little before his death, which took place Aug. 22, 1791. In the Annotations (which upon that part of the Version were posthumous) he refers to the Paraphrase and its ample Notes for the fuller confirmation of his opinion; thus shewing that he had not changed his views. That he might not appear too positive, he adopted the expedient of giving two Versions of the difficult portion.

Paraphrase of Heb. ix. 15—23. 15. "To acquire for us this joyful state, he has become the Mediator of a new covenant, in order that, after the infliction of death, for the expiation of the transgressions which, during the first covenant, remained unexpiated, those who are called might receive the promised inheritance and everlasting possession in heaven. 16. For, where a covenant is made, it is requisite, according to the customs of the nations, that the covenant-offering should suffer death. 17. By corpses and lifeless bodies the covenant first becomes valid in law: but so long as the mediating sacrifice of consecration is not slain, the covenant is not binding, and either of the parties making it may change his mind and retract. 18. So likewise the solemn confirmation of the first covenant was not without blood. 19. But when Moses had read the commandments, as they are stated in the law, to the deputies of the whole nation, he took blood of oxen and goats mixed with water, and, by means

of a bundle of hyssop tied with purple-coloured wool, he sprinkled it upon the book of the covenant, and upon the deputies of the nation, pronouncing these words, 20. *This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath prescribed to you.* 21. In like manner did he also afterwards sprinkle with blood the tabernacle and all the furniture for divine service: 22. and it is a principle almost universal that, according to the law, every thing is purified with blood, and without blood-shedding there is no forgiveness of sins. 23. Such sacrifices the earthly tabernacle required, which was an image of the heavenly one: but when sacrificial blood was to be brought into the great temple of heaven, it was requisite to be of a nobler nature than that of bullocks and goats.——"

VERSION. 15. "And therefore he is the Mediator of a new covenant, that, after the infliction of death for the expiation of the transgressions under the first covenant, those who are called may obtain the promised eternal inheritance.

16. For, where a testament is, it is necessary that the death of the person who made it should be proved; 17. for only by death is a testament valid, and it

For, where a covenant is, the death of the sacrifice by which the covenant was made must follow; for only by death doth a covenant become valid, and it is

takes not effect so long as the testator liveth: 18. therefore also the first was not consecrated without blood: not of binding power while the covenant sacrifice is still living: therefore also the first tabernacle was not consecrated without blood: 19. For after Moses had read to the people all the commandments, as they stand in the law, he took the blood of bullocks and goats with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, and the book itself, sprinkled the whole people, and said, 20. This is the blood of the covenant [*or* testament] which God hath commanded you. 21. Also the tabernacle and all the furniture of divine service sprinkled he in like manner with blood; 22. and, according to the prescription of the law, almost every thing is purified with blood, and without blood-shedding is no forgiveness. 23. Thus it was necessary that the image of the sanctuary in heaven should be purified by means of such sacrifices; but the heavenly sanctuary itself, by nobler sacrifices than those are."

But, whatever interpretation be adopted upon the difficult part of this passage, its bearing upon our present subject of inquiry remains nearly the same. It represents to us the Mediatorship of our blessed Saviour as necessarily requiring for the foundation of its efficacy, that he should die, and that under the precise character of a sacrifice of expiation; and that this sacrifice would effec-

tuate the forgiveness of sins, a participation of all the blessings of God's gracious purpose and promise, and such a moral change on those who had been defiled and rendered abominable by sin, that they should be rightfully admitted to the heavenly state, and that pure and holy state would not incur desecration by their presence.

"Mediator of the new covenant." xii. 24. Here also the connexion illustrates the design of this description. It plainly represents Jesus as the effectual medium of procuring the highest blessings which the majesty of "the Living God," and the equity of "the Judge of all" can bestow. The connexion of this with the next and concluding article of the most grand and beautiful enumeration that was ever penned, cannot be unnoticed. It is a common effect of the association of ideas, especially in impassioned diction, to place subjects in a co-ordinate enumeration, whose connexion with each other does not rest upon a logical parity, but is the result of sequence, dependence, or effect. According to this idiom, "the blood of sprinkling" is to be understood in a most important connexion with "the Mediator Jesus." Heinrichs, a very penetrating and judicious interpreter, though tinctured, I fear, with the system falsely called rationalism, regards it as "a hendiadys, instead of this form, *The Mediator who hath sprinkled us with his blood.*" I cannot refrain from adding

Michaelis's Paraphrase, and some part of his Note.

PARAPHRASE. "Ye have the Mediator of the new covenant, Jesus; and a sacrificial blood, with which ye are sprinkled and expiated, which cries, not as Abel's blood for vengeance, but for pardon on the behalf of even those who shed it."

NOTE. "—— The 'blood of sprinkling' signifies the *sacrificial blood* with which persons were sprinkled. The old covenant had (as Paul remarks, ch. ix. 18—22, from Ex. xxiv. 8.) this sprinkling of blood; but it was unable to take away sin. The new covenant has also its sprinkling of blood, and a nobler one indeed, which speaks for us after the death of the sacrifice, and makes its legal application to God for pardon. In this respect, Paul compares it with the blood of Abel, which too was precious in the sight of God, and on that account is described as speaking after his death. On the other hand, the unworthy blood of beasts might flow in streams, and yet, like the beasts themselves, it remained dumb; it called for neither vengeance nor pardon.——The comparison of the atoning blood of Christ, with the vengeance-crying blood of Abel might appear feeble, if we did not advert to the particular occasion of the allusion.—The apostle was writing to Hebrews, of whom many, or their fathers, had been the actual murderers of Christ.

In an epistle to such a church, which might still recollect the dreadful cry, 'His blood be upon us and our children!' the sentiment was introduced with peculiar propriety, that THIS BLOOD speaks very differently from that of Abel, which cried for vengeance; it implores forgiveness, not only for mankind in general, but even and in particular for the murderers who shed it!"

x. Ἀρχηγός. "*Author* of salvation." ii. 10. "*Author* and Perfecter of faith." xii. 2. "*Author* of life." Acts iii. 15. "*Prince* and Saviour." ib. v. 31. The undoubted meaning of this word is an *intelligent and active cause* of the subjoined state or quality. In each of the passages, the Lord Jesus is so denominated in a declared connexion with his *sufferings and death*, clearly shewing that this high dignity belongs to him in consequence of his being a propitiatory sacrifice, and a reconciling High Priest. See what was remarked before on ch. v. 9. As he could not be himself *accomplished* (τελειωθεὶς) so as to be a suitable and adequate Saviour, without those *peculiar* sufferings which were appointed for him and which he voluntarily undertook, so he is (ὁ τελειωτὴς) *the Accomplisher*, who completes true religion in the character of sincere believers, and confers upon them the perfect fulness of blessings of which their faith is the initiating principle; and this faith, which respects himself as having "endured the cross," is his own gift. "He put the faith

in us; he gave its beginning." *Chrysost. Homil.* xxviii. *in Ep. Hebr.* The same Greek father remarks on Acts iii. 15. "It follows that he had not [τὸ ζῆν] the property of life from another. As the phrase, *author of wickedness*, (1 Macc. ix. 61.) denotes the person who produced the wickedness; and *author of murder* [ἀρχηγὸς φόνου] him who first introduced murder; so the phrase *Author of life* denotes him who hath life from himself." *Homil.* ix. *in Acta Ap.* Clemens of Alexandria calls the Blessed God, ἀπάντων Ἀρχηγός ἀγαθῶν, *Author of all good.* See *Suiceri Thesaur. Eccl.* and *Schleusneri Lexic. in LXX. in voc.* We find a very elucidating instance in 1 Macc. x. 47. where it is said of Alexander Balas, that "he became (ἀρχηγὸς λόγων εἰρηνικῶν) the *first mover* of peaceful negociations." The last of the N. T. instances above mentioned, Acts v. 31. is considered by Heinrichs as an instance of the very frequent Hebraism, hendiadys; and therefore to be precisely equivalent to Heb. ii. 10. with which concurs the late Professor Dindorf, a judicious critic, partly but not altogether of the Ernestian school. If this be not admitted, the other explication is obvious, and founded upon unquestionable reason and usage. From the idea of a beginner, author, efficient, that of a *leader* in any combination of powers or persons is naturally derived; and such a leader is a prince, chief, captain, or lord, as the case may be. In this

sense the word occurs repeatedly, and indeed it is the most usual application of it, in the Septuagint. The verdict of the whole clearly is, that *Christ, by virtue of his sufferings and death, is the* CAUSE *of salvation;* in subordination, of course, to the great and supreme cause, the sovereign grace and mercy of God the Father.

xi. Though the appellative *Saviour* (Σωτὴρ) does not occur in the Ep. to the Hebrews, yet its ideas are so plainly included in other words, that we may justly regard it as belonging to this enumeration. To the passages already mentioned, this must be added: "Wherefore he is able even to *save* to the uttermost, those who come unto God through him, seeing he is ever living to *intercede* for them." vii. 25. Here the perfect and never-decaying powers of Christ, as a Saviour, are inferred (ὅθεν) from his perpetual and intransferable (ἀπαράβατος) priesthood. v. 24. His being a Saviour, then, is *the same* thing as his being a Priest: his efficiency in *delivering* those who rely upon him *from all evil* (the proper idea of salvation), arises from the acts and office of his priesthood, of which his giving himself a sacrifice is so repeatedly and strongly set before us as the principal and essential.

xii. In this passage, also, the *intercession* of Christ is laid down as the correlate of his perfect ability to save. The principal passages besides, in which this subject is stated, are ch. iv. 14. vi. 20. viii. 1. ix. 24. John xiv. 2. 3. Rom. viii. 34.

1 John ii. 1. The symbolical allusion is to the annual appearance of the Hebrew high priest before the representation of the Divine Presence in the most holy place. The reader will recollect what has before been said on the figure of *sitting at the right hand*. We are not to conceive of the intercession of Christ as if it involved any thing imperfect, precarious, or degrading. The words ἐντυγχάνειν and ἔντευξις are of a very general signification; and when connected with ὑπὲρ (for with κατὰ the effect is reversed; see Rom. xi. 2.) include all possible modes of acting on the behalf and for the benefit of others. The precise nature and vast extent of those modes, in which the all-originating love of the Father, the merit of the Son, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, are developed in their ever-new and wondrous energies, we are not qualified to conceive. We are sure that they include all the modes of good, and that they are infinitely worthy of the Eternal Majesty of heaven. But the point of our present reference to the intercession of Christ, lies in this, that it is an act of his glorious priesthood, in which "he offered up HIMSELF." v. 27. The law-term used by Jews and Greeks and Romans, παράκλητος, is by implication declared to be a title of the Lord Jesus, in his own gracious words, John xiv. 16. where he calls the promised Spirit "*another* Comforter;" and it is again applied to the Saviour in 1 John ii. 1. The word strongly impresses the

ideas of our immense interest at stake, our incapacity to maintain it, our dependence on a powerful Patron, and his ability, fidelity, and generosity inexhaustible: but all these ideas, at once so humbling and so consoling, are shewn to *rest upon the great fact* that this our Mighty Patron has offered up himself as a propitiatory sacrifice. "*These things I write unto you that ye sin not;* the whole design and tendency of the doctrine of grace and redemption is to counteract and extirpate sin both in the mind and in practice: *but if*, through the deceptive appearances of things, or sudden surprisal, or the melancholy infirmities and still remaining corruptions of our nature, *any one should sin, we have an Advocate* [translated by Luther, whose taste and judgment in his immortal version will never cease to be admired, *fürsprecher*, spokesman, intercessor, deprecator; and Michaelis, Knapp, and Van Ess, retain the word as the most exact representative of the original,] *with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.*" The studious inquirer would read, with great satisfaction, the late learned and pious Dr. Knapp's Dissertation *de Spiritu Sancto et Christo Paracletis, item de Variâ Potestate Vocabulorum* παρακαλεῖν, παράκλησις, et παράκλητος, in his *Scripta Varii Argumenti*, vol. i. Halle, 1805.

xiii. *Forerunner*, πρόδρομος. "— The [most holy

place] within the veil, whither [as] Forerunner on our behalf is entered Jesus, made a High Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec." vi. 20. The heavenly world is described, as in other passages, by allusion to the most sacred part of the sanctuary: and into that state of purity and happiness the Saviour is declared to have entered, as the first personage, the official chief and representative of all his faithful followers, taking possession and acting on their behalf. How clearly does this answer to his own words! "In my Father's house are many mansions: I go to prepare a place for you: and if I go and prepare a place for you, again I will come and receive you to myself, that where I am ye also may be." Joh. xiv. 3. When our Lord thus said, "I go," he was on the eve of his greatest sufferings and his death. Through that dreadful gate was he of necessity to go, in order to bring his many sons to glory. The same idea is presented to us in this passage of the Epistle. Christ's entering the heavenly sanctuary as our Forerunner, is evidently the same act as his "entering into the holy place, by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption." This, therefore, is but another view of the same great case which is continually coming before us: it manifestly coincides with the preceding representations, and concurs with them in pointing to the sacrificial oblation of our Divine High Priest, as the necessary and sole method by

which sinful mortals can attain the heavenly blessedness.

xiv. *Great Shepherd.* "The God of peace, who, by the blood of the everlasting covenant, brought again from the dead the Great Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus, make you perfect," —&c. xiii. 20, 21. There are at least two ways of connecting the clause which assigns the cause, manner, or instrument, with the rest of the sentence. Many able interpreters connect it with the epithet, and understand it as giving the reason of that epithet; thus, that Jesus is 'the Great Shepherd by the blood of the everlasting covenant;' that is, his power and presidency as the Only Saviour, is in consequence of his death, which fulfilled the eternal purpose of divine mercy. Others regard the clause as assigning the meritorious cause for which the God of reconciliation brought back the Saviour to life, not by mere power, but in the exercise of judicial rectitude: he brought Jesus from the state of the dead, by virtue of the blood of the everlasting covenant; thereby declaring the perfection and full validity of the expiatory sacrifice. Thus the sentiment is the same as in Rom. iv. 25. Michaelis, differing from most of his countrymen who prefer the former interpretation, strenuously supports the latter, in both his works on the Epistle. He thinks that this interpretation is rendered certain by the allusion which he believes

the apostle to have made to Zech. ix. 11, 12. a clear prophecy of the Messiah and the blessings of his reign. "As here the prisoners of Zion are released, on account of *the blood of the covenant*, out of the prison called a pit without water, so Christ is brought again from the dead on account of *the blood of the everlasting covenant;* that is, because he had shed his precious blood, and thereby had established for mankind an everlasting covenant, of which it was a principal provision that they should have in him an everlasting King and an everlasting Advocate. Let it also be recollected, that the promise of the everlasting kingdom of the Messiah is represented as an *everlasting covenant* made with David; and that this is elsewhere applied by Paul to the resurrection of Christ: Acts xiii. 34. compared with Is. lv. 3." *Erklärung*, p. 410. "The blood of Christ, by which he has made for us an everlasting covenant with God, was a full satisfaction for our sins; and therefore he was brought again from death. It is the very same subject that we have met with and illustrated in Rom. iv. 24, 25." *Anmerk. in loc.* "Who was delivered up to death on account of our sins, and was raised again on account of our justification.—— Paul states the matter thus: Christ suffered and died for our sins, as he, by his sufferings and death, has paid to the righteousness of God a full satisfaction; we are therefore declared righteous:

and therefore now our Surety, who hath paid the penalty for us, and on whom any more than upon ourselves no further demand or claim of penalty remains, is raised from the dead." *Uebersetz. u. Anmerk. zu Rom.* iv. 25.

The observant reader will not fail to notice that this pre-eminent Biblical scholar, whom some Unitarians in our country have been forward to admire and commend, as if he in some sort belonged to them, had no difficulty in admitting the representation of the Atonement which is derived from the practice of fines, debts, and legal commutations in human societies: a mode of statement which among us has been disfigured by much misconception and misrepresentation. See some further remarks in Disc. IV.

The very strong and decisive bearing of the passage under consideration, upon our present inquiry, is evident. The character of Christ signified by the ancient figure of a Shepherd, and which holds him forth as the Sovereign and Protector of his people (Is. xl. 10, 11. Ezek. xxxiv. 11—31.), is plainly shewn to rest upon the sacrifice of his blood. The Good Shepherd, whose own the sheep are, *laid down his life* for them: and his return to life proved that his devoting himself to death was accepted and efficacious.

xv. *Son of God.* ——"But Christ [is faithful] as a Son over his" [God's, αὐτοῦ being the best supported reading, not αὐτοῦ,] "household; whose

household we are.—" iii. 6. Here the connexion carries us immediately to the beginning of the argument (v. 1, 2.), the faithfulness of Christ *as High Priest.*

"Having then a Great High Priest who is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God." iv. 14. See the observation under §. ii. The infinite benefit arising from the benevolence and power of this Divine Person, is here again shewn to have its inseparable association with his function as the supreme and only real Priest: and let it be ever remembered that "the *essential idea* of a priest is—to be the presenter of sacrifices, and the propitiator for sins, with God." *Michaelis Anmerk. zu Heb.* v. 1.

"So also Christ assumed not to himself the honour of becoming High Priest, but he [conferred it] who said to him, 'Thou art my Son; this day I have begotten thee:' as also in another [Psalm], 'Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec.' v. 5, 6. The judgment of the Almighty Father decides that none is worthy or competent for this office of the TRUE priesthood, except 'the Only Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father;' and whom 'no one knoweth but the Father.' Joh. i. 18. Matt. xi. 27.

"Though he was the Son, yet he learned, from the sufferings which he endured, the obedience;" *i. e.* the particular kind of obedience which was

necessary for the purposes of his mediatorial undertaking. See above, §. ii.

"The law constituteth high priests men who possess infirmity; but the declaration of the oath, which took place after the law, [constituteth] the Son who is made perfect for ever." vii. 28. The contrast is, between physical and moral weakness, a decaying, dying, and sinful nature, and the qualities of immortality, inherent dignity, and sinless perfection; between a temporary and successional constitution, and one that is fixed for ever by the oath of God, (Ps. cx. 4.); and between a series of mere men, and the one ever-during High Priest, the Son of God. Michaelis's paraphrase is, "The law maketh feeble and mortal men to be priests; but the word of the oath which supersedes the law, not mere men but the Son of God, who is consecrated to be an everlasting Priest." *Erklärung*, p. 214.

"— Crucifying to themselves again the Son of God, and holding him up to insult and ignominy." vi. 6. "— Who hath trampled upon the Son of God, and hath esteemed as an impure thing the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified." x. 29. Unspeakably dreadful as is this crime, on account of the dignity of the Person whom it outrages, it is plainly represented as acquiring a more dreadful aggravation still, from the consideration of the nature and design of his death; and the condition of such persons, as being hopeless of

pardon and conversion, is expressly declared to arise from the fact that "there remaineth no more any sacrifice for sins." A more heart-touching testimony could not be given to the reality and necessity of the Sacrifice of Christ.

xvi. Terms of dignity are accumulated, so as to bear with the fullest effect upon the value of the great propitiation. This is the case in that which Dr. Heinrichs calls "a most noble and sublime passage, in which the Divine Nature of Christ is not indeed formally brought forwards, as in other passages, but is placed as in a vivid picture before our eyes."* The Son of God is displayed in his divine perfection, his all-creating and all-sustaining power, and his universal dominion; so as to produce ideas infinitely above all human, all created grandeur. But, in the mind of a Jew, the objection was at hand, How could this greatness and glory be affirmed of one who was so low in appearance, so mean in his circumstances, so wretched and degraded in his miserable and ignominious death? Was not Jesus despised and rejected, contemned and disesteemed, smitten of God and afflicted? To destroy this objection, the apostle puts into the current of his discourse *the reason* of this depressed and humbled con-

* Egregius profectò et sublimis locus, in quo Divina Christi Natura non quidem disertè, ut in aliis locis, adducitur, sed graphicè tamen pingitur. *Heb.* i. 2, 3. *Nov. Test. Koppian*, vol. viii. p. 38.

dition; a reason which still higher exalts the glory of the Messiah, as it shews his grace and mercy to be equal to his majesty: "he hath, by his own self, made purification of our sins." The term *purification* (καθαρισμὸς) is used by the LXX. for the Hebrew כפרים *atonement* or *expiation*, in the most emphatic form: Exod. xxix. 36. xxx. 10. and the participle occurs in this sense in ch. x. 2. of this Epistle. Such atonement it is here declared that Christ made "by his own self" (δι' ἑαυτοῦ), an expression which denotes the intrinsic value and efficacy of his sacrifice, in contrast with those which "could never take away sins," or "make those who came to them perfect" by giving them the evidence and comfort of acceptance before the just tribunal of God.

This enumeration has now included, if I mistake not, every appellative and epithet which is given, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to our Blessed Lord, under any aspect or relation to his mediatorial character.

II. The second branch of this analysis regards those *properties and descriptive characters* which are attributed to the Priesthood of Christ.

These attributives are so much involved in the appellations given to Christ, that they have necessarily been considered to a great degree already. Little more, therefore, than a recital will be required.

i. The priesthood of the Lord Jesus is *sole and*

unique. He has no partner, rival, or successor, in this office. This fact is so manifestly implied in the whole strain of the apostle's discussion, that it needed not a formal statement. I insert therefore only two sentences; and they have been elucidated above. "And they were indeed many [successive] priests, on account of their being prevented by death from continuing; but he, on account of his continuing for ever, hath the priesthood which can never pass to another.—For the law constituteth priests men who have infirmity; but the declaration of the oath, which took place after the law, [constituteth] the Son who is made perfect for ever." vii. 23, 24, 28.

ii. His priestoood is *perfect;* that is, it is *real,* and not metaphorical or symbolical as was the priesthood of those "who performed the sacred services in a model and shadow of the heavenly [sanctuary;"] viii. 5. — possessed of *all moral excellence;* vii. 26.—and fully *suited* to all the ends and purposes intended to be answered by it; iv. 15. v. 9. vii. 25, 28. viii. 6. ix. 14—28. x. 9, 14.

iii. His sacrifice, the chief object of his priesthood, though comprehending all the sufferings which he endured in his state of abasement, from his birth among men, yet was matured, completed, and presented as an *expiation* for the sins of mankind and a *propitiation* to secure the honour of the divine government, by his painful and

violent DEATH: which, having once taken place, needs not and cannot be ever repeated.

"Who hath not every day need, like the high-priests [of the Levitical institution,] first for his own sins to offer sacrifices, and then for those of the people; for this he hath done once, offering himself." vii. 27.*

"Not that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entered into the holy place every year with blood [not his own, but that] of another: for in that case he must have suffered often from the beginning of the world. But now, once, at the completion of the ages [*i. e.* the former dispensations] he hath been manifested for the abolition of sin by the sacrifice of himself. And, as it is appointed unto men to die once, and after that [followeth] judgment, so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear the second time without sin; [*i. e.* not again to bear the sins of men,] for salvation [*i. e.* full and final,] to those who wait for him." ix. 25—28. "We are consecrated to God [the true idea of ἡγιασμένοι, particularly in this Epistle,] through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once." x. 10. In the first and last of these passages, *once* is not an adequate translation of ἐφ' ἅπαξ or ἐφάπαξ. It denotes, emphatically, the absolute cessation of an act under the idea that it has been perfectly per-

* On the absurd and blasphemous idea that Christ offered for his own sins, see Supplementary Note XVI.

formed; and it would be better rendered by our common phrases, were they not too colloquial, *once for all*, or *once for ever*. "He, having offered one sacrifice for sins unto perpetuity, is seated at the right hand of God." v. 12.

iv. The dignity and merit, power and authority of the Messiah, in his exalted state, imply a continued *presentation* of his obedience and sacrifice as *ever valid and efficacious*, for the pardon and acceptance, the perfected holiness and the eternal happiness, of all who are truly penitent, believing, and obedient. This is Christ's *Intercession*, or his acting as the High Priest in the heavenly world; and it was represented by the Hebrew high-priest's entering into the most holy place, on the annual day of atonement, with the fragrant incense burning, and with the sacrificial blood which he was to sprinkle upon the mercy-seat, over the ark of the covenant, and before the awful symbols of Jehovah's presence. But, with the resemblance, there were also capital points of dissimilitude and contrast. The figurative high-priest approached the symbolical presence of God once only in a year; the true and effective High Priest is without intermission acting in his function:—he offered for his own sins, as well as for those of his brethren; Christ needeth not to do so, for he was without spot:—he offered foreign blood; Christ offers his own:—he stood before the presence of Jehovah,

as a waiting servant; Christ sits down at the right hand of the throne, the symbolical expression to denote his possessing and exercising supreme dignity and authority:—he speedily quitted the sacred place, and proved, by his own experience and that of others, the want of substance and efficiency in his services, as to a moral effect; Christ abideth in the heavenly sanctuary, effectually answering all the purposes of his mediation, reigning and saving, "a priest upon his throne," conferring every blessing upon his faithful subjects, and defeating all the machinations of his enemies:—he ministered on the behalf of only one small nation; Christ is the "propitiation for the sins of the whole world:"—he acted in the routine of a temporary establishment; Christ is the High Priest "after the power of an endless life:"—he was a frail and sinful, feeble and dying man; "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him; he is holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners, made higher than the heavens, made perfect through sufferings, consecrated for evermore;" he is the Son and Lord over his redeemed and reconciled family, the brightness of the glory of God and the express image of his manner of existence, whom all the church and all the angels of God worship, and to whom he saith, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!"

The passages upon which this comparison is founded either have been cited already, or they are so obvious as not to need a formal insertion.

v. The *effects* produced by this glorious arrangement of divine wisdom, holiness, and grace, are stated to be the following :—

1. Ratifying the gospel-covenant, that is, the revealed purpose and plan of God for the salvation of sinful and justly-condemned mankind. vii. 22. viii. 6. ix. 15. x. 7—9.

2. Christ's enjoying the rewards due from the righteousness of the divine government, to his meritorious obedience. Of these rewards, the most grand and gratifying to his exalted benevolence is the *right of conferring infinite and everlasting blessings* upon an inconceivable multitude of sinful and otherwise lost men, in unison with securing and displaying the brightest glory of the divine perfections. v. 9. vii. 25. ix. 14, 15, 28. x. 10—18. besides other passages and the general tenour of the Epistle, all leading us to continue "looking unto Jesus, the Author and the Finisher of our faith, who, FOR THE JOY that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." xii. 2. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of RIGHTEOUSNESS is the sceptre of thy kingdom! Thou hast loved righteousness and hast hated iniquity: THEREFORE,

O God,* thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy companions!" i. 8, 9. See also Matt. xi. 27. Joh. i. 12. xvii. 2.

3. The legal *reconciliation* of God and all sinners who cordially receive the gospel method of salvation. This all-important idea is presented under two aspects.

(1.) *Expiation* or *atonement*. This denotes the doing of something which shall furnish a *just ground* or *reason* in a system of judicial administration, for *pardoning* a convicted offender.

* Ten years ago, I did not venture to render ὁ Θεὸς here in the vocative; see *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 242. But the judgment and example of Michaelis, Dindorf, the younger Rosenmüller, and the recent Lausanne version or revision, have emboldened me to follow. In the phrase *oil of gladness*, the allusion is to the ancient Asiatic custom of pouring upon the heads of the guests, after a splendid feast, a small quantity of a very costly and exquisitely fragrant oil; and the highest measure of honour intended to be conferred upon an individual, was signified by the greater copiousness of this perfume. The imagery in the xlvth. Psalm, is that of a royal bridal feast, in which the bridegroom's table is graced by the presence of other kings; but he has the pre-eminence above them all. In the oriental style, kingdoms and governments were called brides, and the inauguration of a sovereign was a marriage or a marriage-feast. Taking away the metaphor, the sense of the last clause will be of this kind, "God hath pointed thee out as the Saviour and Sovereign of thy redeemed people, by the superabundance of the most valuable endowments and qualifications, distinguishing thee above all other rulers, instructors, or deliverers."

(2.) *Propitiation:* any thing which shall have the property of disposing, inclining, or causing the judicial authority to *admit* the expiation; *i.e.* to assent to it as a valid reason for pardoning the offender.

Expiation therefore regards the condition of the offender; propitiation, that of the judge or sovereign. We can conceive cases in which an expiation, good and reasonable in its kind, might be offered, and yet a wise and good government might not be willing to accept it; *i. e.* might not be *propitious* to the offender and to the proposal for his being forgiven. We can also conceive of a wise and good government being cordially disposed and greatly desirous to pardon an offender; but unable to gratify this gracious disposition, because it can find *no just grounds* for such an act, and it is aware that a pardon arbitrary and destitute of just reason would relax the obligations of law, bring dishonour upon public justice, and prove of pernicious example throughout the whole community.

It is also obvious that *the same* thing may be, and is most naturally fit and likely to be, *both* an expiation and a propitiation; *i. e.* be both a valid *reason* for pardoning and a determining *motive* to the will of the competent authority to admit and act upon that reason.

Now, in applying these terms to the great and awful case of ourselves, the whole world of justly condemned sinners, and our Judge, the infinitely

Perfect God, there are some cautions of great importance to be observed.

(1.) Nothing can be admitted that would contradict incontrovertible first principles. But there are two such principles, which are often violated by inconsiderate advocates of the doctrine of salvation by the mediation of Christ; and the violation of them has afforded the advantage of all the plausible arguments urged against that doctrine by its adversaries.

The first is, the Immutability of God. His moral principles, that is his rectitude, wisdom, and goodness, as expressed by his blessed and holy *will*, can undergo no alteration; for to admit such a supposition would be destructive of the ABSOLUTE PERFECTION of the divine nature, as it would imply either an improvement or a deterioration in the subject of the supposed change. We cannot, therefore, hear, or read, without unspeakable disapprobation and regret, representations of the Deity as first actuated by the passions of wrath and fury towards sinful men, and as afterwards turned, by the presentation of the Saviour's sacrifice, into a different temper, a disposition of calmness, kindness, and grace.

The second foundation-principle is, that the Adorable God is, from eternity and in all the glorious constancy of his nature, gracious and merciful. He wants no extraneous motive to induce him to pity and relieve our miserable

world. No change in God is necessary or desirable, if even it were possible. This is abundantly evident from many parts of the divine word: *e. g.* Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7. John iii. 16. vi. 39. x. 17. Eph. i. 3—10. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

(2.) This great concern is entirely one of Law and Administrative Wisdom. The great God is, in the unalterable nature of things, and from the necessary volitions of an infinitely perfect mind, the Righteous Ruler of the universe, intellectual as well as physical. Over the latter he rules according to certain fixed principles, some of which he has enabled mortals to discover; and they have called them *Laws of nature*. Over the universe of intellectual beings, who act from volitions and are governed by motives, he rules also according to certain fixed principles; and these are the Laws of the moral world. Our knowledge of them is derived from himself; partly as he has implanted them in the moral instincts of our mental nature, partly as he has made them discoverable by our reasoning powers, and partly as he has given them clear expression by the voice of revelation.

The question, whether sinners shall be pardoned, is not one that can be referred to arbitrary will or absolute power. It is a question of law and government, and it is to be solved by the dictates of wisdom, goodness, justice, and consistency. God's disposition to shew mercy is original and unchangeable: in this sense nothing

is needed to *render* him propitious. But the way and manner, in which it will be suitable to all the other considerations proper to be taken into the account, that he should shew mercy, *none but* HIMSELF *is qualified to determine*. To deny this would be manifest folly and impiety. Now we have found, and the design of this volume is to present the evidence on the case, that HE *has determined*, and has given us to know that pardoning and restoring mercy shall be exercised in the way of *mediation* and *expiation*.

From these facts it clearly follows, that a phraseology derived from the administration of government and law is proper and necessary, in all our considerations upon this, the most momentous and interesting of all concerns. "God is the Righteous Judge: and God is angry [with the wicked] every day." But this anger is not a commotion or a mutable passion: it is the calm, dignified, unchangeable, and eternal majesty of the JUDGE; it is his *necessary* love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity. In this his rectoral capacity, therefore, the maintenance of law, the enforcement of equity in relation to the unchangeable distinction of right and wrong, is not a matter of neutrality or of option; and it involves the necessity of marking sin with a *suitable* demonstration of its moral evil and of the displeasure with which it is regarded by the Eternal Jehovah; and *this* is *punishment*. The execution of such punishment,

which, having been determined by unerring goodness and wisdom, cannot but be strictly proper, must follow in the regular course of moral antecedents and consequents. The promulgation of this course is a *threatening;* and it is rendered proper by a regard equally to the honour of the government and to the benefit of the governed. Threatening and punishment impress justly and necessarily with the idea of the displeasure of the Lawgiver and Judge. Pardon, when, on any consideration, it takes place, brings the true and just idea of a *change:* but that change, in the great case before us, is not in the mind or character of the Supreme Ruler; but it is in the administration of his government, and in those outward acts by which that administration is indicated. This change is, in the order of moral right, the effect of an adequate *cause*. This cause lies in the whole Mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus Christ, but most particularly and essentially in his sufferings and death; and these have constituted the EXPIATION.

Let it also be remembered that this method of "grace reigning through righteousness" has not come from any extraneous influence, in its invention, suggestion, or operation. It is the pure and sole emanation of the FATHER'S *infinite, eternal, and unchangeable* LOVE. It is the exercise of *free* and *sovereign beneficence*.

It also follows that the terms, *anger, indignation,*

wrath, sentence, threatening, punishment, remission, reconciliation, propitiation, and similar expressions, are, under all the circumstances, most proper to be employed, and are the best calculated to produce a just sense of the evil of sin, and many other salutary feelings; yet that we should be careful to understand them as expressing *modes* of the divine administration, and *effects* of the divine counsels, but *not affections operating upon* the Divine Nature, nor *changes* in it. A creature who is under the guilt and dominion of sin, stands in that position, with respect to the necessary and unchangeable attributes of God, which is fitly expressed by terms denoting the strongest displeasure and abhorrence. A change of state and character, so as to be brought into a new set of relations to the divine attributes, is as fitly expressed by the language of love and approbation. For example: "God is jealous and the Lord revengeth, the Lord revengeth and is furious, the Lord will take vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth wrath for his enemies.—Who can stand before his indignation?—The Lord is good, a strong hold in the day of trouble, and he knoweth them that trust in him." Nahum i. 3—7. "And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee; for thou wast angry with me; thine anger is turned away, and thou hast comforted me!" Is. xii. 1. Upon a different application of the same general prin-

ciple, the varied dispensations of God's righteous providence towards his sincere yet imperfect people are represented by similar expressions, yet all referring to modes and effects of the divine administration. "O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away!" Dan. ix. 16. "Thus saith thy Lord, Jehovah, even thy God who pleadeth the cause of his people, Behold, I have taken out of thine hand the cup of trembling, the dregs of the cup of my fury; thou shalt not drink it any more." Is. li. 22. Yet we are not warranted to understand such passages as these, as indicating a real change in God; any more than we should be to believe that he is the subject of hope, of fear, of precarious expectation, of wishes, of disappointment, and of regrets, because, in condescension to human infirmity, and to the state of mental culture in the infancy of the human race, the external forms of the divine dispensations are described in language borrowed from those affections in men: *e. g.* Gen. ii. 19. iii. 22. vi. 6. Deut. xxxii. 19, 27, 29. Is. v. 4. and many other passages.

The *change* by which a guilty and polluted sinner becomes freed from the sentence of condemnation, pardoned, regarded with complacency, and qualified for the noblest employments and delights, *is not in God;* but it is in the *relations* under which the sinner stands towards

God, and in the state of *his own mind and character* consequent upon those altered relations.

The importance of the subject must furnish my apology for having so much extended these observations. I have only to add, that passages which express the doctrine laid down in this part of the apostolic writings, on the reconciliation of sinners to God, as an effect of the sacrifice and an act of the priesthood of Christ, have been already cited, under different heads: consequently it is only requisite to give their notation. ch. i. 3. ii. 9, 17. vii. 27. ix. 12, 26, 28. x. 10, 12, 14. xii. 24. xiii. 20.

4. It is another effect of the sacrifice of Christ, that those who sincerely receive and rely upon it, become *entitled* to the blessings of salvation, in all their fulness and extent. ii. 17, 18. iv. 16. vi. 17—20. xii. 22—24. "We have an altar, to eat from which they who minister in the [Jewish] tabernacle have not a right." xiii. 10. It is probable that θυσιαστήριον is here put, by a just metonymy, for the sacrifice which was offered upon the altar. Under the typical law, the ministering priests had certain portions assigned to them of the inferior and private sacrifices: but of those greater sacrifices, the burnt-offerings which were the most public and solemn expiations for sin, and whose blood therefore was taken into the most holy place by the high-priest

(v. 11.) on the great annual atonement, they had no participation; the whole was consumed by fire, part upon the appropriated altar, and part at the outside of the encampment, so long as the Israelites were in the wilderness, and afterwards without the precincts of the temple. (See Exod. xxix. 10—14. Lev. xvi. 6, 11, 14, 27.) Now the apostle represents the great High Priest of Christianity offering up himself *as a sacrifice of this last kind*, the most public, solemn, sacred, and expiatory. "Wherefore also Jesus, that he might sanctify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate" of the temple and the city. The weighty sentiment, then, which the apostle urges, is, that of the benefits accruing from this true, spiritual, and efficacious sacrifice, those cannot partake who adhered to the now abrogated and empty sacrifices of the Jewish temple, in rejection of Christianity. Necessarily, therefore, the opposite holds; that all who believe in and obey the Lord Jesus do partake of those benefits, *holy, real, and eternal blessings*, by a right derived from the sacrifice and from Him that offered it.

5. It has also the effect of *purifying* and rendering fit to be presented to the Holy Majesty of heaven, the *persons* of those who rely upon it: that is, the serious consideration of this great truth is made, by the gracious influence of Him who is expressly called the Spirit of Christ, effectual to produce the disposition and the motives

to sincere, universal, and persevering obedience, a cordial consecration to God, and a practical devotedness to his service. ii. 10, 11. viii. 6. 10. ix. 14. x. 10, 22. xiii. 12.

It confers the privilege and enjoyment of the most favoured *access to God,* by devotional communion in the present state, and by the ineffable felicity of the heavenly world.

"For there takes place, both an abolition of the preceding commandment [*i. e.* body of institutes comprehended under this single term] on account of its weakness and inefficiency, (for the law made nothing perfect;) and an introduction of a better hope, by which we draw near to God." vii. 18, 19.

"— That we may have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us; which we have as an anchor of life both sure and steadfast, and entering into the inner part of [the most holy place within] the veil, whither a forerunner is entered on our behalf, Jesus, become a High Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec." vi. 19, 20. The general idea and the intention of this beautiful passage are obvious; but some difficulty attaches to the imagery. The scene is that familiar one in this Epistle, the most holy place in the Jewish sanctuary, considered as the symbol of the immortal state of blessedness in communion with God. Except in the single word *anchor*, there is

nothing that approaches to the allusion to a sea-storm, and the means of safety from it; and the metaphor of an anchor entering into the innermost room of a building, or the adytum of a temple, is quite incongruous. Michaelis, who so happily pointed out the allusion to the ancient practice of asylum-stones, could not free himself from the difficulty except by the hazardous resort to conjecture. As he held that the original of this Epistle was written in the vernacular language of the Jews of Palestine, he supposed that the Greek translator either misunderstood the Syro-Chaldaic word before him, or from some other cause wrote ἄγκυρα instead of ἀκρογωνιαῖος or some other word signifying a corner-stone. But there is no necessity for such a violent remedy. Not only is an anchor the well-known metaphor for *refuge, protection,* or *means of safety,* (whence Hecuba calls her son *the anchor of her house;* Eurip. Hec. 79.) but it is very remarkable that Roman writers living in or near the apostolic age used the word to denote a FOUNDATION. "Ancora metaphoricè ponitur pro refugio, præsidio, munimento, et non semel pro fundamento apud Plinium, Apuleium, et Solinum." *Rob. Stephani Thesaur. Ling. Lat.* We also find the phrase ἄγκυραι βίου in a fragment of Sophocles; "Children are to their mother anchors of life." *Brunckii Lexic. Sophocleum,* voc. Ἄγκυραι. This has suggested to me the translation above ventured upon, of the text under considera-

tion; for I hardly need to remind a student of the New Testament that ψυχὴ is used for *life*, in almost innumerable instances. To complete these materials, we have a passage adduced by Wetstein from the Scholiast on Ælius Aristides, in which he says that the proverb, *The sacred anchor*, "refers to the refuge which existed at sacred places, and which was a security to those who fled to them." Σημαίνει τὴν εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ γινομένην καταφυγὴν, ἥτις ἦν ἀσφάλεια τοῖς εἰς αὐτὰ καταφεύγουσιν. *Aristid. ed. Jebb*, vol. ii. p. 194.

Supported by these evidences, I think that we may safely regard the following as a strictly just metaphrase of the difficult clause:

"— Which hope we hold fast as the foundation of life, [the life of the soul, its salvation and eternal happiness,] both safe and firm, and going [in consequence of its position in the wall of the temple] into the very interior of the most holy place, [where is the peculiar presence of God."]

Now let the reader consider that he is not to form his idea of the *corner-stone*, repeatedly alluded to in the Scriptures, from the science of modern or of classical architecture, but from the practice of building in remote and ruder ages. Let him imagine a massive stone, like one of those at Stonehenge or Abury, cut to a right angle, and laid in the building so that its two sides should lie along the two walls, which meet at a corner, and thus binding them together in such a way that

neither weather nor force could dissever them. The term ראש פנה (Ps. cxviii. 22.) does not necessarily signify that it would be put at the top of the building: it only necessitates the idea of a very important position, which would be strictly predicable if it lay a few courses above the lowest, so as to act by its weight on those below and to serve as a renewed basis to those above.

These preliminaries being understood, I shall quote some passages from the sagacious author to whom I have often referred, and to whom (with every caution against his occasional precipitancy) I own myself greatly indebted.

Ps. cxviii. 22. "*The stone which the builders have thrown away, is made to be the* CORNER-STONE. I understand this literally. It appears that, probably at the building of Solomon's temple, one of those stones which David had taken care to get provided and made ready for use, was found fault with by the builders and declared to be useless, and that God, for altogether different reasons, commanded by a prophet, that this stone should be made the corner-stone. The orientals regard the corner-stone as the one peculiarly holy stone in a temple, and that it confers sanctity upon the whole edifice. It is therefore the more probable that, either by the Urim and Thummim (the sacred lot of the Jews,) or by a prophet, God was consulted, which stone he would direct to be taken for the corner-stone. The answer was, that

which they have perseveringly rejected and declared to be quite unserviceable. Certainly it must have been for a very important reason, that God positively appointed this stone to be the corner-stone. But the New Testament discloses it to us, in Matt. xxi. 42. and 1 Pet. ii. 7. The Jewish nation would conduct themselves towards the Messiah, precisely as the builders did towards this stone, and would reject him: but God would select him to be the corner-stone, which should support and sanctify the whole church." *Michaelis Uebersetz. u. Anmerk.*

Is. viii. 14. "*For he will be a holy-stone for refuge, and a stone for stumbling over and falling to both the nations of Israel.*—'Holy-stone,' literally *a sanctuary:* but under this expression, denoting an object over which persons may stumble and fall, a temple cannot be understood. The following connexion shews that a *holy-stone* is intended. Such sacred stones were very frequent among the eastern nations of antiquity. Jacob, for instance, erected one: Gen. xxviii. 18. These holy or consecrated stones were also usually employed for *the corner-stones of temples.* Sanctuaries or holy places, temples, altars, and holy stones, possessed the right of an *inviolable asylum,* and persons fled to them, even in war, for security from being put to death. In this passage God is represented as a holy-stone, to which those who trust in him flee, and through whom they are safe: but he who

desponds and puts not his confidence in God, is compared to a person who, full of terror, runs blindly forwards, sees not the stone that lies in his way, falls over it, and is severely hurt." *Anmerkung z. d. o.* of the same valuable work, a *German Translation of the Bible, with Annotations for the unlearned,* in twenty small quarto volumes, Gottingen, 1770, to 1792: "a work by which the most learned may profit," says the late Bishop Middleton, in his *Doctrine of the Greek Article,* p. 452. The illustrious author died on August 22, 1791, at the age of seventy-four. By the application of this fact concerning the ancient consecrated stones, he also explains Is. xxviii. 16.

To bring all this to bear upon our present passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is not now difficult; nor is it necessary to extract more from the distinguished scholar in whose steps I am treading. Perhaps there actually was such a consecrated corner-stone in the walls of the then existing temple at Jerusalem, one part of which might be seen and touched in the sanctuary, while the other part was in the most holy place, within the veil. But this supposition is by no means necessary; for the sacred writer is treating of the heavenly holy of holies, and the approach of believers to it in the faith and devout affections of their minds; and no author or reader expects that metaphors and imagery, employed for elucidation and impression, should have at the very time an external and literal existence. The sentiments

may, I conceive, be truly represented thus: "As a trembling fugitive, fleeing from the drawn sword of pursuing vengeance, gains the temple, flies through its outer court, rushes into the sanctuary, clings to the corner-stone of which he knows that the part unseen is within the veil, and present where no enemy or avenger dares to enter, and thus feels safe and happy; so the true believer receives the promise of salvation and the oath declaring the Saviour's everlasting priesthood; he flees to the inviolable asylum of that Saviour's sacrifice, whose efficacy reaches to the very mercy-seat, and connects the faith of the Christian on earth, with the glory of God's peculiar presence in the spiritual world,—he exults in the unalterable veracity of his covenant-Father,—he pours out his soul in grateful praise and humble prayer,—and he enjoys the purest and most solid comfort, under all his exposure to dangers, sorrows, and temptations."

"We have not a high-priest who cannot sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who has been tempted in all respects like to us, only without sin. Let us then approach with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and may find grace for the most pressing time of need." iv. 15, 16. This beautiful and consoling passage needs no comment.

"Having therefore, brethren, liberty for the way of admission into the most holy place, by the blood of Jesus, a way of admission which he hath opened for us, a fresh and living way,

through the veil, that is, his own flesh; and [having also him as] a great Priest over the household of God; let us approach [the throne of the Most High] with a true heart,—" &c. x. 19—22. The εἴσοδος, *entrance, way of admission*, evidently relates to the thoughts, affections, and devotions of Christians, by which they have all that intercourse of the mind with God which is compatible with a state in which the capacities of the soul are confined by its union to an earthly body. This access Jesus (ἐνεκαίνισεν) has prepared, opened, consecrated as a new house or temple was dedicated. It is (πρόσφατος) "fresh," belonging to the new covenant, newly proclaimed by the doctrine of Christianity; see the adverb in Acts xviii. 2. These are the only places in the New Testament; but the instances in the LXX. are very illustrative: "*fresh* grapes," Num. vi. 3. "gods that have come up new and *fresh*, Deut. xxxii. 17. and so in Ps. lxxx. (lxxxi. Heb.) 9. "nothing *new* under the sun," Eccl. i. 9. "forsake not an old friend, for the *fresh* one is not equal to him," Wisd. of Jes. ix. 10. It is a "living way;" life is found upon it, in contradistinction from the approach to the symbolical Divine Presence in the Israelitish sanctuary, which was permitted, under pain of death, to none but the high-priest, and to him only once a year: See Lev. xvi. 2. The dying of "the flesh," *the human body* of the Lord Jesus, is poetically

compared to a rupturing of the veil in the temple, thus laying open the innermost part of the sanctuary, the most holy place. In another form of expression, this privilege comes to us "by the blood of Jesus." Plainly, then, the chief sentiment and object of this highly picturesque and striking passage, is to urge the devout and grateful use of the glorious privilege of drawing near to the Majesty of God, in holy exercises of mind; and to impress upon us that this unutterably valuable blessing is conferred only in consequence of the *blood and dying* of the Lord Jesus; which is evidently equivalent to saying, in virtue, or by the excellency, of his sacrifice.

7. Of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ it is another effect, that heavenly blessedness will receive his faithful people, without being thereby contaminated and degraded. This is a very bold and striking idea, and admirably calculated to affect our minds with a most awful sense of the intrinsic, intractable, insufferable, incurable baseness and vileness which belongs to sin. It represents us as defiling every thing that we touch, polluting our very mercies, and turning every thing away from its right use and enjoyment. But such is the sovereign efficacy of the blood of Christ, that it *guarantees heaven from being dishonoured* by an unsuitable intrusion. This fact was represented in the Hebrew ceremonial by the institution, that all the parts and utensils

of the sanctuary were to be purified by the application of sacrificial blood, both before and after they were brought into actual contact and employ by either the priests or the people. See Lev. viii. 15, 23, 24. xvi. 16, 18, 19.

"It was therefore necessary that, as the resemblances of those things [which constitute the state of perfection] in heaven were to be purified by these [inferior victims,] so those heavenly things themselves, by sacrifices superior to these: for Christ hath entered, not into the sanctuary made by [human] hands, which was only a representation of the true [sanctuary,] but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf." ix. 23, 24. The meaning of this passage is sufficiently plain: and it receives confirmation from the succeeding verses, which have been before commented upon. The plural form, "superior sacrifices," appears to be used as a declaration of the general truth, that, though, for a temporal and ceremonial cleansing, animal purifications had served; yet, for a real, spiritual, holy, and eternal effect, sacrifices of intrinsic worth and transcendent excellence would be necessary. The sequel points out the application of this general proposition to the particular case before us. By the sole and efficacious sacrifice of our Immortal High Priest, who "offered up Himself;" believers are prepared for heaven, and heaven is made ready for them.

In all these aspects does the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews present the reasons, relations, and effects of the office which Christ sustains as the High Priest of his church. To what an extent has this survey carried us! Yet it is but a mere sketch, and, in respect of most of the particulars, it has been concise and abrupt. We have found our Lord and Redeemer described as the PRIEST, the Great Priest, the High Priest,—Sole,—Supreme;—divinely appointed in a manner consonant with his unrivalled dignity;—standing in an assumed relation to mankind, for the purpose of making a sacrificial and consecrating offering;—submitting to the most bitter sorrows, agonies, and death;—effecting a real propitiation and expiation for the sinful state of mankind, in all the senses and respects which are suitable to the immutability of the divine perfections, and the glorious honour of the divine government;—rich in power and grandeur, and equally so in compassion and tenderness;—absolute for all the purposes of salvation;—possessed of all moral perfection;—exalted above the highest of created natures;—taking as his own, and occupying as his indisputable right, a station of glory and dignity which only Deity could assume;—reigning with an invincible dominion over all created beings, to the happiness and joy of the holy, and to the restraint and just punishment of the rebellious;—and

bestowing on sinful and undeserving men the greatest blessings, not shadowy and figurative, but real, substantial, enduring, and boundless; the pardon of sin, the favour of God, conformity to the holiness of the Divine Nature, and everlasting blessedness. Other august and instructive titles are also given to our Lord Jesus Christ in relation to his priesthood. He is held forth to us as the *Messenger*, sent by the Eternal and most Merciful Father, and fulfilling the great moral design of the Levitical institution;—the *Minister* of the most holy place, presiding over the universal worship of his people, and rendering it acceptable to the throne of perfect purity;—the Lord who spake by the prophets, and now by his apostles, concerning the great salvation acquired by his sufferings;—the *Sanctifier*, who by his blood consecrates and presents to God all his true followers;—the *Brother* of those for whom he came to die, and whom he condescends, as the act of a superior nature, to nominate into this endearing relation to himself;—the *Surety*, a pledge of salvation from God to man, and of obedience from man to God;—the *Mediator*, transacting the most important concerns between the Righteous Ruler of the world and his revolted subjects, in order to their reconciliation and restoration, and accomplishing this great work by means of his sacrificial blood;—the *Princely Author* of life, faith, and salvation, achieving his

great purpose by his sufferings and death;—a *Saviour* to the uttermost, because he offered up himself and hath an unchangeable priesthood;—an *Intercessor* and *Advocate*, faithfully and powerfully maintaining our infinite interests, upon the ground and reason of the propitiation by his blood;—the *Forerunner*, securing to his followers the heavenly inheritance, by virtue of his priestly obligation;—the *Great Shepherd*, conferring the blessings of the everlasting covenant, through the efficacy of his blood;—the SON OF GOD, partaking the flesh and blood of the children of Adam, that through his own death he might accomplish their redemption; and to depreciate whose blood is the most dreadful of offences.

Such being the declarations concerning the personal character of our Divine High Priest, and his qualities in the discharge of his office; we have collected from the same source, additional illustrations of the OFFICE itself, and its necessary adjuncts. It stands *alone* and *unrivalled;*—it is *perfect*, for all the purposes of divine mercy and wisdom;—it is a *real* priesthood, all others being but emblems and representations of it;—it contained the essential quality of a priesthood, the offering of an *immolated sacrifice;*—this sacrifice is efficacious by a continual *presentation* in the heavenly world;—and it produces the most happy EFFECTS,—the *ratification* of the promulgated covenant of grace,—Christ's mediatorial right of

conferring infinite blessings;—the *reconciliation* of sinners to their justly offended Sovereign;—*entitling* to the full benefits and enjoyments of the great salvation;—it is the great instrument by the efficient grace of the Holy Spirit, in *producing personal holiness;*—by it Christians have the most favoured *access* to the throne of grace;—in a word (and could a more touching representation be presented to a creature's mind, of the majesty of eternal holiness, and the efficacy of the great sacrifice?—) it guards the purity of heaven from being dishonoured by the admission of those who, without the purifying blood, would have been odious and disgusting.

Should any object, that these views have been deduced only from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that their force is abated by the objections to its canonical authority, I offer two replies.

1. Let them impartially consult the authors who have examined the questions relating to the genuineness, apostolic authority, and inspiration of this Epistle. Let them seriously study it, in its simple text, with close attention and fervent prayer. Let them ask, whether it is possible, without violating the most satisfactory rules of literary criticism and common sense, to affirm that it could be written at any other period than about the latter years of the life of Paul. Let them fairly consider, whether the personal allusions at the end can be referred to any other

writer. Let them ask, whether it is possible to believe it to have been the work of a forger.*

2. I earnestly solicit their attention to the passages quoted, and arguments constructed, in the preceding Discourse on the Sacrifice of Christ, from other parts of Holy Scripture. It is true that, in no other part of the New Testament, is Christ actually styled a Priest: and this indeed supplies some reason for the assertion that, without the Epistle to the Hebrews, there would have been a serious defect in the completeness of the New Testament as an explication and completion of the Old, and particularly as a developement of the motives and objects of numerous parts of the Patriarchal and Mosaic institutions, which can be referred to no satisfactory ground of utility, civil or religious, if their symbolical character be relinquished. But it is also true that in so many other passages Jesus Christ is represented as laying down his

* This is not the place for entering into the full discussion; but I beg leave to drop a hint or two. The absence of the name and usual salutation at the commencement of the epistle, has been often urged as an objection. To me it appears a powerful argument on the other side; for, while we can assign very satisfactory reasons which might strongly influence the apostle not to prefix his name, according to his ordinary practice, no probable reasons can be imagined to have prevented Luke, or Barnabas, or Clement, or any other contemporary Christian.

life for his people, giving himself for them, and being a sacrifice in so doing, that the idea of his acting as the Priest who presents his own sacrifice is plainly included. He himself affirmed that Psalm to refer to the Messiah, in which he is declared by the Eternal Father, to be a Priest for ever. And, finally, there was a very obvious and weighty reason for reserving this application of the Levitical terms and offices till so near the catastrophe of the Jewish nation, that the danger would be past of its being made an article of accusation against the Christians of Judæa.

From the preceding investigation, it appears very evident that they are greatly mistaken who represent the Priestly Dignity of our Blessed Saviour as only an accommodated and figurative mode of expression, useful at the time for conciliating some of the Jews, but now needless and obsolete. Indeed the supposition itself, which is the basis of this theory, is really unreasonable and self-destructive. The design was to answer the objection of a Jew against Christianity, that it had none of the privileges and impressive grandeur of the old law, and that it swept away acknowledged divine institutions, without assigning a good reason or substituting any thing better in their stead. This objection the writer of the Epistle professes to remove, by denying its assumption, and saying that no real privilege or blessing of the former dispensation was lost; that Christi-

anity truly had its sanctuary, its sacrifice, and its High Priest; that these were infinitely more glorious than the correspondent objects under the law; that those were only shadows and emblems, while these were the *reality* of the things declared, the substantial, immortal, soul-beatifying good. Yet, after all, upon the hypothesis, these high and splendid representations are made without truth and solidity; they are the play of fancy; they are an ingenious management to humour and please certain predilections; they were invented merely to elude the objection, while the writer knew that they were no honest answer to it. Was such a way of argumentation likely to answer the purpose intended? Would it not, much more certainly and effectually, revolt an ingenuous mind, and confirm in, not simply a rejection, but a contempt of the religion of Jesus? Would not a conscientious Jew have viewed with horror the assertion that "the Holy Spirit signified" (ix. 8.) such a meaning by the most important of the Levitical ceremonies; when this was not indeed the fact, when not the least resemblance to such an intention had existed at the prescription of that part of the Mosaic ritual; when, to confess the truth, it was nothing more than a happy thought of the present writer, to answer a temporary conveniency?

Again, I would ask, can any serious and devotional person (for a light and profane scorner,

or a flippant presumer, should apply to other lessons before he sets up himself to judge on questions like this,) read the Epistle, particularly the part here chiefly to be regarded, mark and sympathize with its holy fervour, its sublime piety, its deep and constant feeling of God, judgment, and eternity,—and believe that the argument so positively averred, so triumphantly concluded, so awfully urged, is a creature of the writer's imagination, a tissue of artifice, a mystification?—Indeed, I cannot but fear that the persons themselves, who have invented this all-convenient hypothesis of accommodation, have so formed the habit of using popular language with ambiguous meanings, in order not to shock the multitude, that they have no moral delicacy in such matters; and that they therefore feel less scruple in imputing to the original teachers of Christianity the course in which they themselves scruple not to walk. Some of these writers even make it a moral duty to refrain from the public refutation of popular evangelical opinions, because it would be a barbarous, impious, and cruel invasion of the peace and comfort of our fellow-christians; a peace and comfort which, if we were once thus to break up, we could never restore. (*Heinrichs in Ep. ad Heb.* p. 250. See also his *Excursus V.* on the Acts.) Surely the serious fact implied in this concession ought to awaken a suspicion in the minds of those learned persons, that *the truth* of the subjects lies not on

their side, and that, while they profess themselves to be so loftily wise, they are really becoming fools. Well would it be for them if they would receive a caution from their distinguished countrymen whom I have so often quoted, in his Version and Annotation on Psalm cxix. 118. "*Thou separatest all slacks* [furnace-refuse] *from thy law, for their deceit is falsehood.* By *slacks* in this passage is meant that which is unsound, the ordinances of men, set in opposition to the commandments of God; or false explanations of it: these God regards as worthless, and throws them away. The latter clause is equivalent to saying, The new interpretations and artful additions, which they endeavour to annex to thy law, are nothing but deception." *Michaelis.*

And, after all, what do they gain, if they sincerely believe Christianity to be, in its principle and in its fundamental doctrines, a revelation of truth and mercy from God? A professed and adroit defender of the falsely styled *rationalist* system assures us that "the accommodation-plan alters not the essence of a doctrine, but merely procures for it a more advantageous admission into the understanding and the heart." (The German translator of *Mr. Rose's Discourses on the State of the Protestant Religion in Germany;* p. 65. Leipzig, 1826.) Then *the facts* remain the same, whatever becomes of their external form and the fashion of their clothing: God is a holy Lawgiver, man an inex-

cusable sinner, Christ an Almighty and Righteous Saviour; salvation is effected only by his obedience and sufferings; heaven is a holy world, and divine influence is necessary to prepare man for it; sin is the supreme evil, and leads to irretrievable misery. And, if these be the facts of the case, if such be the state of things for the human race and for eternity, only let the *rational consequences* be acknowledged; and we shall be satisfied. But, alas! little reason have we to look for the realizing of this hope. The tendency and objects of the Neological system indicate too plainly what its motives are. They are put in so fair a light by the late excellent Dr. Tittmann, that I believe the citation will not appear too long to any serious and intelligent reader.

"What, in fine, have our modern scholars imagined themselves to have gained by this *historical interpretation* of theirs? It lies in the following particulars, which I will state in their own words: that the positions of religious doctrine, delivered by Jesus and his apostles, whether referring to faith or to practice, are merely historical, or that their importance and authority consist solely in their being materials for narrative, but in no respect attaching to matters of sentiment; in other words, that they contain the opinions which Jesus and the apostles entertained, but not absolute and eternal truth; fugitive reasonings and temporary institutions, belonging

to the men of those times, and to them probably beneficial, but not necessary determinations of what is in its own nature right or wrong;—that these declarations were not immutable, of universal interest and importance, to salvation, for all men of all ages;—that they were a temporary rule of believing and acting, not constant, sure, and intended for mankind in all future times;—that whatever therefore is elicited from the primitive documents of the Christian religion, by historical interpretation, is only matter of historical utility;—that the whole body of Christian doctrine itself is only historical; that is, we may learn from it merely what Jesus and what the apostles maintained, believed, and taught to the men of their age, and what they wished to have known and believed by them; but not what ought to be known and believed by all men without exception;—that Jesus himself did not promulgate, nor ever intended, nor ever was able, to promulgate, a system of doctrine which should be a binding rule of faith and conduct, which should have power and authority through all ages, which should be the way of salvation for all men of all future times, which should be necessary to be received with a cordial faith by all who desire eternal salvation;—that it was indeed the purpose of divine providence to promulgate by Jesus Christ a few principal truths, as necessary to be known and believed universally, but that Christ was not himself aware

of this;—that much less did the apostles know or understand any religious doctrines as certain truths, or did, or could teach them as certain truths, or ever imagined that the doctrine which they delivered was a perpetual rule of faith and practice;—that they had their heads full of wild expectations about the end of the world as near at hand, the second coming of Christ as soon to take place, an earthly reign to be entered upon at his coming, and other things of that kind;—that Jesus therefore, in delivering his instructions, did not and could not have any reference to the inhabitants of the world in future ages;—that his whole system belonged only to the persons of his own time and country, the Jews alone;—that he accommodated himself to the opinions of the Jews, opinions resting upon no solid foundation of truth, that according to these opinions he spake and taught, that according to these we must interpret his declarations, but that, whether they were true and deserving of approbation and belief, we are to judge for ourselves;—that, in fact, what Jesus taught was not always true, not always to be relied upon;—that consequently the system of doctrine which he delivered was not a divine revelation, as we are accustomed to call it;—that it was nothing but a body of Jewish moral philosophy;—that the origin of the knowledge and doctrine of Jesus is a matter of historical investigation; that is, it must be derived from studying

the opinions and decisions of the Jewish rabbies and other superior men of that time, from whose tuition or conversation, aided by his own talents and industry, he derived all his wisdom; — that he was ignorant on many subjects, that he was often in error, and taught error both to the people at large, and to his own disciples, and that he allowed these errors to be diffused among the body of Christians;—that yet these very errors in Jesus and his apostles were overruled by divine wisdom, so as to be beneficial at the time;—that, however, some of the doctrines delivered by Jesus and the apostles were true, and are of course to be maintained as true, yet not because they were taught by them and are contained in the sacred writings, but only because, and so far as, they are found consonant with the dictates of reason; — that all are not true and sure and necessary doctrines of religion, which are found in these books, and are commonly reputed to be therefore true and sure and necessary; — that many are uncertain, needless, and merely temporary opinions and institutions; — that the sacred books have no claim whatever to be regarded as of divine origin and authority, —that by historical interpretation we have both the right and ability to determine, whether the doctrine therein taught can and should be regarded as divine, and worthy of a divinely commissioned teacher;—that whatever is not ad-

mitted by historical interpretation to be a divine doctrine, is not to be so esteemed;—that it is not to be admitted that the sacred writers could not err, and did not in fact err; but that the reverse was the case;—that the sacred books in general, and particularly, the narratives of the Evangelists, are of doubtful origin and authority.

"Such are the fancied discoveries of historical interpretation! What then is Jesus to us; what his work, what his merit for the salvation of man; if he were not a teacher of divine and eternal truth, deserving of our fullest confidence, and sent from God? Why should we inquire into the doctrine of Christ; if he had it not from God, but learned it from the doctors of his age, or hammered it out of his own inventive mind, and intended it for his countrymen merely? What need we care about his coming upon earth, his death, his resurrection, his ascension to heaven, his sitting at the right hand of the Father,—facts on which we rest all our hope of eternal salvation; if his teaching and that of his apostles be worthy of no credit? What becomes of the plan of salvation by faith in Christ, in which the apostles taught that all ages to come should behold and admire the boundless grace of God, his love to man, his unutterable wisdom; if the doctrines and precepts and institutions of Jesus were temporary and transitory things? What avail the miracles of Jesus, to which he so often appealed as indubitable evidences

of his divine mission; if, after the insane folly of Woolston, they are to be tortured into allegories; or, which is still worse, to be put down among the effects of natural causes, by which Jesus deceived, or at least allowed to be deceived, the ignorant vulgar? What value belongs to the Gospel History, which we regard as the basis of faith and piety; if it contain fictions and silly fables? Of what use are the Holy Scriptures, which the pupils of gospel truth universally receive as the only and decisive and infallible rule of faith and guide of life; if the sacred writers delivered, not the oracles of God, but their own and other people's theorizings? Or, if their declarations are to be esteemed true and divine, not on their own account, and because they have come by divine communication; but solely because human reason chooses to acknowledge them as true and divine? Why should we labour in the interpretation of Scripture, if that interpretation must rest, not upon the fair and grammatical investigation of the words and phrases, but upon presumed opinions concerning the subjects; not on the just use of language and the proper means of acquiring it, but on the decrees of reason, that is, of the philosophy now in vogue? What avail the whole body of practical religion, the serious study of things relating to God, faith and hope in Christ, the entire harmony of Christianity; if the reason and idolized philosophy

of man be the sole fountain of divine wisdom, and the supreme judge in matters of religion? What then is the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, more than an obsolete system of philosophy? In fine; if this be not, what is, to deny Jesus the Lord, to assault him with blasphemies, to render his divine mission doubtful, or indeed empty and exploded, to combat his doctrine, basely to disfigure, to wound, to hold up to ridicule, and, if it could be effected, to suppress Christianity altogether, and make it a separate thing from religion, to confine religion within the strait bounds of self-called and domineering reason, to make miracles a laughing-stock, to charge with silly vanity, defame, and torture the Holy Scripture, till it shall be subdued to an entire accommodation to the good pleasure and the sovereign decisions of man's wisdom, to corrupt it by daring conjectures, to drag it into contempt, to crush its divine authority, to weaken, shake, and utterly overthrow the foundations of the Christian faith?

"The end of this career can only be what all history, by abundant evidence, has demonstrated: that, with the undervaluing and proscription of the word of God, its sincere grammatical interpretation, and the liberal erudition of languages, all religious principles will be despised, adulterated with the foulest corruptions, entirely overthrown, and reduced either to a vapid name of Natural Religion, or to a chaos of mysticism, than which

nothing is more pernicious to Christian doctrine, or to a paltry system of mythic fables, or to a crude mass of poetical fancies, wrapped up in figures and fictions. To this last notion not a few divines and preachers of our day seem to have a strong inclination; as, in delivering their religious teachings they seem wonderfully delighted with the gliding shades of tropes and figures, sensible images, and plays of fancy, such as formerly were characteristic of the tribe of mystics and fanatics, and by which, while they are toiling to soften down the doctrines of faith, and make them more agreeable to human reason, they miserably deceive both others and themselves. And, finally, the result must be, that gross ignorance of all divine truths, rude barbarism, and their inseparable companions, degrading superstition, dreams of wild fancy, monsters of opinion, and every kind of vice and wickedness, will burst in with irresistible force upon the Christian church, and spread far and wide their baneful dominion! *We shall lose the Gospel,* the Reformers used to say, and with the fullest reason, *We shall lose the Gospel, if we lose learning!* And so must we forebode, if we lose the interpretation of Scripture, by the fair and impartial methods of grammatical study." *Meletemata Sacra, præf.* p. xxi.—xxvii, Leipzig, 1816.*

* This excellent writer, Dr. Charles Christian Tittmann, Lutheran Pastor and Superintendent at Dresden, died Dec.

I cordially wish that the Unitarians of this country would seriously consider, whether they are not treading in a path, whose character and tendency coincides with that against which the German Professor thus raised his faithful protest.

It is necessary to add, that there are, among the modern divines on the continent, some of a very different character from that of the Neologists; yet who have accustomed themselves to say that Christ is not properly, but only figuratively, a priest and a king. But with them it is merely a question of words. They simply mean that Christ was not a Levitical priest, serving in the temple at Jerusalem; just as he was not a king of an earthly sovereignty, having the visible insignia and attendants of temporal royalty. In reality, they do not appear to hold any thing different, on this point, from what we regard as scriptural truth. Yet let me be allowed to repeat, that the propriety of language would be more

6, 1820, aged 76. His principal works are, *Tractatus de Vestigiis Gnosticorum in Novo Test. frustra quæsitis;* 1773. *Opuscula Theologica,* containing fifteen very valuable dissertations; 1803. *Meletemata Sacra,* a Commentary on the Gospel of John; 1816. Dr. J. A. H. Tittmann, Prof. of Divinity at Leipzig, is, I presume, his son: among whose numerous publications, which are chiefly in German, are two cheap and commodious editions of the Greek Testament, lately published.

consulted, were we to affirm that the Lord Jesus is the ONLY *proper* priest that ever was or ever will be; and that all others, to whom that name has been legitimately given, were only shadows and pictures of him.

DISCOURSE III.

ON THE ATONEMENT MADE BY CHRIST.

The view of the work of Christ as a Saviour which comes under the notion of Expiation, Propitiation, or Atonement, has been adverted to in the two preceding Discourses, as immediately arising from the idea of a Sacrifice; but I conceive that advantage will be gained to the cause of truth, by a more detailed exposition of the principles upon which this mode of representation rests, as they may be deduced by plain reasoning upon the necessary circumstances of accountable creatures.

I. That the Author and Lord of the universe exercises a perfect *Moral Government*, consisting in the duly apportioned manifestations of his approbation and disapprobation, over rational creatures, is capable of being demonstrated to any impartial mind, with abundant evidence, from different sources of argument; such, for example, as the necessary perfections of the Deity; the

analogy of his physical government, in which order and law are so wonderfully observed; incipient strivings, as it were, and breakings forth of moral retributions in the present state; the feelings and expectations of men on their own behalf; their conduct towards each other; and that instinctive sense of moral differences, in dispositions and actions, which is invincible and indelible in every human mind.

II. The sum of all that man can obtain of satisfactory knowledge concerning the principles and rules of God's moral government, which hold the same rank in the intellectual system that the laws of matter and motion do in the physical, constitutes *the Moral Law.*

III. The whole spirit and requirements of the Moral Law lie in the single idea of *Justice;* that is, rendering to every being that which, in right, he ought to have.

From this one source might be deduced, by a process of plain and undeniable reasoning, all the requirements and prohibitions of the Moral Law. Consequently it is the same as the *Law of Nature,* or the collection of moral principles which men in general, without any positive revelation, have the power and opportunity of inferring from their own feelings, wants, and wishes, acted upon by the occurrences of individual experience and social life. "For, since the Gentiles who have "not a [written] law, by nature [φύσει, instinct,

" disposition, or moral sentiment,] do [τὰ τοῦ νόμου] " the things directed or prohibited by the law, " they, though they have not a law [in a written " and external form] are to themselves a law; " who [therefore thus] manifest the law's opera- " tion [ἔργον, business or purport,] written in their " own hearts, their consciences always bearing a " testimony, and their inward reasonings on both " sides either accusing or pleading for them." Rom. ii. 14, 15. Upon these grounds it is that the apostle affirms the heathen, even with all the refinements of their philosophy, to have been " inexcusable" in their abandonment of the true God, their idolatry, and their other wicked practices; because " that which can be known " [τὸ γνωστὸν] concerning God is manifest in them, " for God hath [so] manifested it to them;—they " know God,—they perceive [ἐπιγνόντες] the righ- " teous judgment of God." ch. i. 20, 19, 21, 32.

The Ten Commandments comprise the great principles of the Moral Law, expressed in the concrete form of application to one particular species under each genus; and with a small addition of positive precept, namely in the case of a specified time for religious celebrations. This, therefore, might be mutable and temporary; while all the rest, being moral, must, in its own nature, be of immutable and eternal obligation.

When our Lord reduces these precepts, and every moral injunction delivered by " the law

and the prophets," to *two;* and the apostle still further contracts them into *one;* the dispersed forms are merely brought back to the general principle, which is LOVE, or feeling and wishing kindly to the objects with whom we have connexion, or of whom we have knowledge. But this is only a case of *justice.* We feel and wish kindly to ourselves, and *we irresistibly take up a sense of disapprobation, condemnation, and repugnance* towards a fellow-creature who shews himself to feel and wish unkindly towards us; we conceive that he does us wrong, that he commits a violation of justice against us, that he is on that account blame-worthy, and that consequently *he deserves* some *mark of righteous disapprobation,* which is the precise definition of *punishment.* If our wish and expectation of moral duty from a fellow-creature towards ourselves be *just,* it is *equally just* that we should feel and act in the same way towards him: and this therefore is one part of the divine law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The other part rests, with the same irresistible strength of evidence, upon the same principle. Our Blessed Teacher calls it "the first and GREAT commandment:" for in the worth and weight of its binding *reason,* that is, in the estimation of *pure* JUSTICE, it exceeds every possible obligation to any creature in the proportion that ETERNITY exceeds time, that INFINITY is greater than a limited existence,

that DEITY transcends a frail creature or the universe of creatures. The *claims* of GOD to the entire affections of every rational being, rest upon *his merits*. Those merits are the compound result of his infinite *perfections* and of *the exercise* of some of those perfections in the benevolent creation and preservation of dependent nature. Therefore the merits and the claims are *necessarily* INFINITE, and "the great commandment" is nothing but the demand of JUSTICE; "Thou "shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, "and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, "and with all thy strength."

IV. The requirements of the Moral Law, to the fullest extent that is deducible by reasoning or made known by revelation, are not the dictates of the mere or sovereign *will* of the Deity, but are the results of the real nature of things and the propriety of relations.

For, if the moral rule enjoined by God to direct the practice of rational creatures, were the result of mere will, or an option of indifference, then it might have been made otherwise from what it now is; it might even have been opposite to that which is actually constituted. Injustice, therefore, would have been justice, and justice injustice; hatred, envy, and ingratitude would have been commendable; and benevolence, generosity, and a thankful feeling towards those who are kind to us, would have been blameable, disapproved by God,

and deserving of punishment; — if omnipotent will had been pleased so to ordain. If any man were to affirm that this is not a sufficient reducing to the absurd and impossible, I should be obliged to decline any further arguing with him.

We may reason in another way. The will, which determined the present constitution of moral obligations, acted either from motive or not, with reason or without reason. If the former, then *the motive or reason* which led to the result was *that ground of propriety* for which we plead: if the latter, the supposition is plainly absurd.

If then the Moral Law be the result of the real nature of moral things, there must be an original and necessary difference in that nature, and the actual *reason* of the Moral Law must have been an intrinsic goodness, truth, and excellency in the dispositions or actions approved; and an intrinsic vileness, baseness, unreasonableness, and unfitness, in those which are disapproved.

It also follows that this reason of the Moral Law is *eternal* and *unalterable*. It has not sprung out of any arbitrary constitution of things, but out of an impartial consideration of what is right or wrong, originally and of itself, irrespectively of consequences.

Further; since this reason must be always the same, the obligation of the law which rests upon it must be always the same: that is, it is the necessary and unalterable duty of every rational

being to love God with all its powers, and to love its fellow-creatures as itself; or, to do justice.

If we attempt to ascend still higher in tracing this reason of the Divine Will, we arrive at the Total Perfection of the Divine Nature, as the infinitely glorious and absolute, the Sum and Essence of all good, the primary and ultimate reason of all that is wise, right, and morally beautiful. Higher we cannot go: and a wish to go higher would be both absurd and impious.

Again; it plainly follows that the theory which lays utility, expediency, or self-interest as the foundation of moral obligation, is erroneous. This results by arguing *à priori* upon the simple principles just mentioned: and it is easy to establish the same conclusion, *à posteriori*, by tracing the practical operation of the expediency-system. True indeed it is, that conformity to the approving will of God is conducive to individual happiness and to the general good, and must eventually produce the highest degree of both. This is therefore a sound *accessory* reason of moral obligation: our objection lies against the raising it into the primary reason.

Further; this great truth, relative to the supreme reason of moral obligation, shews *the utter impossibility* of (1.) the Socinian hypothesis, which maintains the exercises of divine justice to be optional to the divine will: (2.) the Arminian hypothesis, which supposes the original law of

perfection to have been repealed, or lowered in its demands, by divine grace; and that a mitigated or remedial law is put in its stead: (3.) the Pseudo-Calvinistic opinion, that unconverted men are under a disability or impotency, which prevents them from complying with the requirements of the divine law, any other than that which arises out of the criminal disaffection and voluntary repugnance of their own minds: and (4.) the Antinomian doctrine, that the obligation of the Moral Law is extinguished, with regard to believers in the Gospel. Only admit *the ground* of the Law, as consisting in the highest original REASON, and the reverse of all these schemes will follow by the clearest necessity: the most dreadful degree of wickedness, in the present life or in the life to come, can never relax the smallest ligament in the obligation of the sinful being to love and obey God: and the saints on earth and the perfect spirits in heaven now feel it, and for ever will feel it, their sweetest happiness and highest glory to be UNDER THIS LAW. Thus is demonstrated the grand moral apophthegm so beautifully expressed by the pious and amiable Hooker: "Of LAW there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power: both angels and men,

and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all, with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy." *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book I. Sect. 16.

V. *Holiness* is the respecting of the *due relations*, or the objects of intended reference which *ought to be*, in the performance of actions.

These due relations are, the infinite worthiness of God as resulting from the glorious attributes of his nature,—the supreme end of honouring him,—and the subordinate ends of advancing the moral perfection of ourselves and others, that is the greatest benefit of the universe, so far as our influence can reach.

In other words, Holiness is a conformity to the moral law.

Holiness is not only the preferable term, on account of its being scriptural; but it appears to be the most exact for expressing the generic idea of moral goodness, and including the three species, namely, *Piety*, or devotion towards God, *Virtue* in the knowledge, government, and employment of ourselves, and *Morality* in the discharge of all obligations which respect our fellow-creatures.

VI. *Sin* is the absence of respect to the due relations of actions.

Such mere absence leaves the moral agent in the state of vicious defect: and, since the affections (which are either mental actions or the springs of mental actions) cannot remain inert,

their activity and other essential properties, which are in themselves a natural good, continue to act, but act under a bias or influence which is unnatural and sinful: they act, therefore, from wrong impulses, in wrong directions, and to wrong objects. So that the state of sin, or the being a subject of inhering sinfulness, is both a state of habitual vicious defect, and a state of vicious activity in those desires, emotions, motives, cherishing of principles, and outward acts, which are contrary to the moral law of nature which was shewn above to be the Law of God, and are therefore contrary to nature, that is, unnatural. The first of these views of the state of sin, is the primary idea of sinfulness, and the most simple that we can form; the second is a derivative and complex idea, necessarily ensuing upon the other, and of the greater importance in practical applications.

Considered with respect to the Moral Law, whether perfectly or imperfectly known, and from whatever source the knowledge of it may have been derived, Sin is the violation of it; and it evidently involves disaffection, neglect, opposition, rejection, contempt, and insult.

VII. Since God is the only uncaused, self-existent, and independent Being, possessing all possible perfections, the Author and Preserver of existence to all other beings, and the source of all that constitutes the good of their existence; it

follows that the essential principle of *happiness*, to a conscious mind, consists in the *manifested favour of God.*

The manifested favour of God consists in the assurance of being approved by him, the consciousness of possessing those enjoyments bestowed by him which are unequivocal evidences of his continued approbation, and the persuasion, resting upon his promise, that those blessings shall be extended, or succeeded by still greater ones, to immortality.

This is evidently *the supreme good* of man, or of any other creature; and, in its endless progression, the highest perfection of the human, or of any other intelligent nature. It is described in Scripture by a variety of simple and expressive terms, often figurative, but always beautiful and heart-touching: such as life, eternal life, glory, honour, heaven, the presence of God, the light of his countenance, the joy of his salvation, the fulness of joy, the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord, the crown of righteousness; the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in the heavens; the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb.

VIII. It is impossible that the favour of God should be directed towards a being under the power and dominion of sin.

In other words, a Being of all possible perfec-

tions cannot be regardless of justice and the due relations of things.

IX. A being under the power of sin is, both by the subjective fact and by the necessary operation of the Divine Perfections, separated from the favour of God; and, since it has the powers of intelligence and reflection, it must be conscious of the separation. But the intensity of feeling, resulting from that consciousness, will be different, according to the degree of objective knowledge possessed in any given case.

Hence must accrue a feeling of unutterable and interminable loss, a sense of seclusion from the only source of real happiness, the privation of all that makes existence desirable, remorseful recollections, agonizing prospects, despair.

Such would be the effect of sin in the progress of rational feelings, if its course were permitted to flow, without controul or mitigation, according to its own nature and proper tendency. But in the present life, the operation of sin is impeded, and many of its most baneful effects are suspended, by innumerable interferences of the divine goodness. God has a purpose of mercy to fallen man. A system of grace is established, very gradual in its developement, admirably complicated in its machinery, and inconceivably comprehensive in its designs and effects. Mankind are put under a discipline of providential circumstances and moral means; all having an adaptation to promote moral

good, by awakening, rebuking, humbling, encouraging, and supplying the means of breaking those associations of feelings and ideas which are false and bad, and of forming others which are true and morally exalting. The divine system of mercy surrounds our guilty world with an atmosphere of natural and moral good, and scatters an endless variety of personal and social enjoyments. All the forms of occupation are produced, the competition of individuals, the grouping of communities, the collision of interests, and innumerable provisions of the remedial order. Hence arises endless employment for the senses, the affections, the memory, the imagination, the anticipations, and the active faculties of men. Thus, to a very great degree, the natural tendency of sin is counteracted during the season of merciful probation: while yet, for purposes of benevolent monition, that baneful tendency is permitted to show itself by producing effects painful and sometimes horrid, on certain occasions, and to a certain extent. While the full and proper operation of sin is thus held back and suspended, enough is allowed to break through to demonstrate the fact of a sinful and ruined state, and that men may not be able to plead ignorance of their circumstances. Yet all these measures of condescending wisdom, beneficence, and warning, are perverted by men to the increase of sensuality, pride, security, insensibility, and all the forms of impious theory

and obdurate practice. Experience and observation shew that the character of duplicity, self-shielding, and yet severely condemning others, which is drawn in the following description, is not the picture of a few only of mankind, but belongs to the whole species, under innumerable forms of subtilizing and refinement. "Wherefore, thou "art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that "judgest: for, wherein thou judgest the other "thou condemnest thyself; since thou thyself, "who judgest, doest the same things. But we "know that the judgment of God is according to "truth, against those who do such things. And "thinkest thou, —— that THOU shalt escape the "judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches "of his kindness and forbearance, and long-suffer-"ing; NOT ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE KIND-"NESS OF GOD LEADETH THEE TO REPENT-"ANCE?"

Besides this natural course and effect of sin, it is also to be considered in its relation to the retributive exercise of Divine Justice. Sin is a direct offence against the moral government of heaven; it is raising the flag of rebellion and defiance; it is striking at the root of that authority on which repose all the order and happiness of the universe. It therefore involves blame, guilt, and inexcusableness: and it DESERVES inflicted or positive punishment.

Compare the remarks under proposition XXI.

X. The Moral Law must be a *faithful expression* of the infinite perfections of God, particularly his *rectitude*, including holiness, justice, and veracity: because that original truth and reason of things of which that law is the expression, is nothing else than the perfect and unchangeable nature of infinite moral goodness.

XI. This law must be *immutable* in its rights and requirements; for resting upon the basis of the divine perfections, it is not susceptible of improvement; nor can it permit relaxation, which would be sanctioning wrong and betraying itself.

The sentiments of these two propositions have also been shewn above (under Proposition IV.) to follow, as necessary inferences, from the primary reason or ground of the Divine Law.

XII. God, whose essential excellence is the origin and example of all rectitude, and his authority the source of universal law, is the ultimate *object* of moral obedience and disobedience.

XIII. The *measure of obligation*, binding to yield obedience to any law, is in the compound ratio of the intrinsic propriety and excellence of the precept, and the right of the authority which enjoins it.

In the case before us, that of the Moral Law enjoined by God, both these considerations apply in the highest, that is, in an infinite degree. Therefore the *obligation* of this law is *infinite*, in these two views: first, that it is greater than any

opposing considerations that can ever be adduced or conceived; and secondly, that it is limited only by the capacity of its subject, so that, in whatever way and to whatever degree that may be increased through all future existence, the obligation will be still paramount.

XIV. An intelligent being is hurt or injured, when it is intentionally deprived, by a voluntary agent, of any property, right, enjoyment, or happiness, to which it has a just claim; or when it is molested or hindered in the enjoyment of its rights.

XV. The Deity is not capable of receiving physical injury: but he is susceptible of *moral injury*, by the diminution or total abstraction of the respect, love, and obedience which are due to him from any of his rational creatures.

XVI. Such injury sin inflicts upon the Great and ever Blessed God. It denies his right to, and diminishes or totally withholds his possession of, the respect which is due to him as the Head of the universe, the love which he deserves on account of his infinite excellencies, and the obedience which he has commanded as the Sovereign Lord and Law-giver.

The truth of this remark is obvious to even a superficial observer, in those overt acts of sin which contain a direct attack upon the perfections and authority of God; such as atheism, blasphemy, idolatry, perjury, profane expressions, and con-

tempt of divine institutions; and slight reflection is sufficient to show that it is implied in all indifference and neglect of God, and the regards which he claims. But if any were to dispute the applicableness of the position to those dispositions and actions by which we sin against ourselves or our fellow-creatures, we would beg him to consider, that it is not the immediate reference only of any conduct that we have to bring into the account, but its indirect and ulterior bearing. If I violate or neglect to improve my own virtue, or if I transgress the rules of morality towards my fellow-creatures, I do indeed sin directly against myself or them; but my offence does not stop here. The laws which bind me to personal virtue and social morality are not less the laws of God, and the reason of them is not less founded in the original principles of moral right, than in the highest instances of devotional piety. In all the cases, God's express authority and command are violated; and therefore it is HE ultimately who is insulted and injured.

XVII. Moral obligation *fulfilled*, is either the immediate cause, or the less prominent, but yet the efficient principle, of all the order, harmony, and happiness in the intelligent universe: but the *violation* of moral obligation is the cause, proximately or remotely, of all the misery that has ever existed, or that ever can exist.

Compare the remarks under Proposition IX.

XVIII. The misery produced by the violation of moral obligation is *illimitable*, unless God be pleased, out of his sovereign goodness, to interfere for the purpose of counteracting it.

This is readily evinced by reflecting on the inevitable operation of the faculties of thought, association, memory, and anticipation, (see Proposition IX.) so far as the offending individual is alone concerned. But, in consequence of the social constitution and innumerable connexions of mankind, other persons besides the actual transgressor in any given case are involved in the consequences of his offences. Hence are all injuries of every kind and at every point in the scale of aggravation; by fraud, by violence, by withholding, by infliction, and in all ways whether direct or indirect; the effects of evil example; the seducing others into sin; the reciprocal emboldening and hardening of persons in a course of sin: and these, with all their correlative associations and direct results, multiply and diffuse themselves in every part of the awful progress. So far as the sphere of action can reach, sin corrupts, degrades, debases, and tends to make at once wretched and mischievous, every being that is susceptible of its influence.

XIX. *Retributive Justice* is the attribute of an intelligent agent, endowed with competent authority and power, by which it is disposed and abled to render to other moral agents that treat

ment which is congruous to their dispositions and actions.

Retributive Justice is either *Remunerative* or *Punitive*.

XX. The Remunerative Justice of God is the exercise of his rectitude towards holy dispositions and actions, wherever existing, by all those manifestations and effects of his approbation, which may seem fit to his infinite wisdom and benignity.

Compare Proposition VII.

The manifestation of God's favour, in any way which to him may seem good, cannot but produce the highest possible happiness to the conscious mind. In Deity is nothing torpid or inert. The supreme perfection must be active in the communication of good, in every form, to every object, and by every method, which infinite wisdom and rectitude see to be fit and right. In all rational beings which shut not themselves out, by their sin, from this communion, every internal and external capacity of receiving delight, must be opened, and constantly filled from the source of all purity and joy. The habitual enjoyment of this unspeakable good, the inward serenity of a conscience unpolluted, and the indubitable prospect of this blissful existence to immortality, cannot but be productive of a steady, permanent, calm yet exquisite, and ever-growing state of pleasure. "In thy presence is fulness of joys:

"at thy right hand, pleasures for evermore." With reference to his power to confer supreme good, HE is styled "the happy and only Po-"tentate;" and the grand instrument of his beneficence is marked with the same heaven-fraught allusion, "the gospel of the glory of the happy "God." 1 Tim. vi. 15. and i. 11.

XXI. Punishment is some suffering, or natural evil, inflicted as the desert of moral evil, upon an accountable and offending being, by a competent authority, and according to a law previously made known.

On the natural and inevitable sense of moral desert, see the observations under Proposition III.

This is called *Positive* Punishment: and all the forms of natural evil which are the spontaneous or direct effects of sin, may be called *Natural* Punishment. See Proposition IX. The right to enact positive punishments, as the manifestations of displeasure against crime, and a mode of deterring by example from its commission, cannot be contested on any sound principles of reason. A system of government, domestic or patriarchal, or national, never existed upon earth without them; nor indeed is it conceivable: for, without penal sanctions, a code of law would be nothing but a set of counsels or recommendations. That such sanctions have place in the

Divine Government, is manifest from innumerable declarations of the inspired writings. Scarcely a page of scripture is without them, and in the didactic parts they occupy a very awakening prominence. They accompany the richest declarations of gospel-grace. They seal up the two great portions of the oracles of God; but the latter of them, the dispensation of love and mercy, in the more awful style of description.* That these denunciations are expressed in language borrowed from all that is most terrible in the powers of visible nature, cannot be viewed as authorizing any diminishing of our sense of horror at the dreadful consequences of sin, but is only a demonstration of the condescension and earnestness of God; thus employing the most awful imagery to represent sufferings of which we cannot too strongly con-

* "Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked; between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not. For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Mal. iii. 18. iv. 1. "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and sinners, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, will have their portion in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Rev. xxi. 8. "God will add unto him the seven plagues which are written in this book." xxii. 18.

ceive, to shake our unfeeling souls, and to arouse us that we may "flee from the wrath to come;" and "escape the damnation of hell."

If, however, we were to forbear from urging, in the present argument, this awful branch of the dictates of natural reason and the disclosures of positive revelation; and if we were to insist only upon those exercises of Punitive Justice which are the spontaneous and necessary consequences of sin, as much as any natural effects of any natural causes; we should have grounds abundantly sufficient for the purposes of the present argument. Were we even to concede that the Deity could remit the positive punishments of sin, by a determination of his gracious will: yet this would not effect the salvation of the sinner. This measure of gracious will, (the supposition of which, however, I by no means think tenable) would be merely *the forbearing from certain positive acts* of righteous power, merely *waiving a right*, merely *declining to effectuate* that which, speaking analogically, as the scriptures so often do, would be an insulated act in the procedure of the Blessed God, alien from the ordinary tendency and character of his government, and which he would not execute without the greatest reluctance, "his strange work."* But under a very different respect in moral consideration,

* Is. xxviii. 21.

would come the arbitrary taking away of the natural and necessary consequences of sin. *These are not inflictions*, but they are events and states of things which *follow of themselves*, according to the general constitutions of the universe, the laws of intellectual and moral nature; constitutions and laws which are essential to the harmony and well-being of God's entire world. To intercept this course of things, which infinite wisdom and goodness have established, to prevent these effects from ensuing, when their proper causes have already occurred, is not a case of forbearing to act; it is the exact reverse, it is a case of acting. It would be an interference of the Deity to suspend the operation of his own laws, to cut off the connexion between the cause and the effect, to change the course of nature: it would be *to work a miracle.*

XXII. According to universal experience and observation, and the undeviating testimony of history, every individual of mankind who is capable of reflection, has just reason to consider himself as a transgressor against the Moral Law of God; and therefore guilty of violating the wise and good order of the universe, cut off from the favour of God, involved in the dreadful consequences of transgression, and deservedly exposed to all the penal sufferings which the justice of the divine government may have seen right to denounce.

A most comprehensive and affecting picture of the evidence of this fact in the moral state of mankind, is in President Edwards on Original Sin, Part I. Chapter I.

That which is shewn by fair evidence to belong to all men, so far as observation can reach, is justly to be considered as belonging to men universally.

XXIII. The testimony of the holy scriptures, of whose divine origin and authority we have previous and decisive evidence, confirms the inference from our own experience and observation; and it asserts, in the plainest terms, the universal sinfulness, guilt, and ruin of mankind.

Principal passages containing these assertions are Eph. ii. 1—3. Rom. iii. 9—24. v. 6—10. See also the scriptural evidence adduced by Mr. Edwards, Part II.

XXIV. The scriptures also, with equal strength and clearness, affirm the certainty and the tremendous effects of the exercise of God's punitive justice upon mankind as sinners.

See the preceding Discourse on the Sacrifice of Christ, page 25 and 37: and add 1 Sam. ii. 25. Ps. xi. 5, 6. ix. 17. Rom. ii. 2—9. i. 18. 2 Thess. i. 6—9. Rev. xxii. 15.

XXV. Man being in these awful circumstances, the following appear to be the only possible results.

i. That God, by an act of omnipotence, deprive

him of existence. But this supposition is opposed by two considerations.

1. We have no evidence from experiment, analogy, or revelation, that God ever has annihilated any being which he had brought into existence, material or spiritual; or that he ever will do so. All known facts in natural history, and all analogies from facts, support the reverse of this supposition.

2. The supposition implies that absolute power might be employed to counteract the demands of justice; which would be no other than making arbitrary will or mere force to be superior to the claims of rectitude and wisdom: for it has been shewn (Prop. I.—IV.) that the perfect justice, which is essential to the Deity, is the necessary foundation of his moral government; and (Prop. VIII.) that it requires that sin should be adequately punished.

ii. That the Law of God be altered and abated, either in its requirements of obedience, or in its penal sanctions; or in both respects.

1. This would be a constructive acknowledgment, on the part of the Supreme Lawgiver, that he had demanded more of the affections and obedience of his creatures than wisdom and equity warranted, or than he could persist in enforcing: in other terms, that his law had been imprudent and unjust, and that he was obliged to retrace his steps upon discovering their consequences:

—suppositions so flagrantly inconsistent with the foreknowledge and the moral attributes of God, that to mention them is sufficient for their rejection.

2. As the demands of the law are nothing more than that justice should be done, any receding from those demands would be so far a legalizing of injustice: that is, it would cause the Being whose essential character is infinite rectitude, to be a promoter of sin, and an accessory to his own wrong and to the disparagement of the whole holy universe.

3. An abrogation of the sanction would amount to this; that, though the moral cause, sin, remained, its proper effects should not follow: which is the same as this, that, the reasons of justice still existing, they should not be acted upon, but that the Deity should interpose, by his omnipotence, to protect and patronize sin.

iii. That the proper effects of sin fall upon the sinner, according to the just and natural course of things.

Dreadful but righteous result!—Yet be it recollected that, in whatever instances this case may be ever realized, God will be displayed to the fullest conviction of all upright beings, to have been throughout holy and just, good and glorious.

But this is the case, to avoid which is the great object of our most serious inquiries. "How can

man be just with God?—What shall I do, that I may be saved?"

iv. That some compensative resource be discovered and carried into effect, by which the salvation of the sinner shall be obtained, in consistency with the honours of the divine government.

And THIS, we gratefully believe, HAS BEEN EFFECTED, BY THE WISDOM AND HOLINESS OF GOD, TO THE PRAISE OF THE GLORY OF HIS GRACE. To communicate the knowledge and enjoyment of this unspeakable gift, is the chief purpose of divine revelation.

Some presumptions might have been argued, in favour of this cheering hope, from the preservation of the human race and the extensive benignity of providence, under the admitted circumstances of human depravity and guilt; from the analogy of numerous blessings communicated to men, by instruments of a mediatorial and remedial kind; and from declarations in the scriptures assuring us of Jehovah's gracious readiness to pardon and save sinners, while the same scriptures as strongly assure us of his unchangeable holiness and justice.

The positive evidence upon which we are enabled to rest our assurance of this heart-reviving truth, and its connexions with the whole process of raising our nature to its highest moral perfection, it is the object of the other parts of this

volume to elucidate. The writer will have the greatest reasons to be thankful and happy, if this end be accomplished.

"Knowing, therefore the terror of the Lord, "we persuade men: and we are made manifest "unto God. By grace ye are saved, through "faith; and this is not of yourselves, it is the gift "of God."

DISCOURSE IV.

ON THE REDEMPTION EFFECTED BY CHRIST.

Every reader of the New Testament must be aware that the work of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the deliverance of man from his state of sin, is frequently represented by language borrowed from pecuniary transactions among men, sometimes by the liquidating of a debt, and so obtaining the release of the imprisoned debtor, and sometimes by the payment of a ransom for the deliverance of a captive taken in war. Both these are familiar ideas to men; especially in turbulent times and countries, such as were those in which the phraseology of the scriptures was formed. That, in application to our present subject, they are metaphorical; and that they both coincide in the leading idea, of *relief* from a state of ruin *by means of a commutation;* scarcely need to be observed. But, as this figure has furnished occasion for unjust and impious scoffing on the one hand; and on the other, for ignorant, extravagant, and highly mischievous declamation by persons professing to hold the orthodox doc-

trine; it is a desirable object to place it in a clear and scriptural light.

It will be useful, first, to elucidate the signification of λύειν and its derivatives occurring in the New Testament, by a few examples from authors who wrote in Attic, or in common Greek. This verb, whose general meaning is *to release*, is used to denote both the act of him who has a captive in his power, and who, for any consideration, *sets him at liberty*, and the act of one who *procures the liberation*, by paying a ransom or any other means: but in the latter sense the middle voice is most generally, and with stricter propriety used. So we read in Demosthenes, "The laws enjoin that (ὁ λυθεὶς) he who is ransomed from the enemy, should be the property (τοῦ λυσαμένου) of the person who has redeemed him, unless (ἀποδῷ λύτρα) he repay the ransom-price." Hence, λύτρον, ἐπίλυτρον, and the plural λύτρα denote the *ransom-price*; ἀντίλυτρον expresses the idea of commutation a little more strongly: λυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν, and ἐκλυτροῦν signify *to pay that price*; λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, and ἐκλύτρωσις, the *act* of ransoming, and, by a metonymy which is almost universal in the use of abstract nouns, the *effect* of such ransoming or the *state produced by it*. Some of these words occur more rarely in the general sense of their primitive, to denote deliverance by any means. A small number of citations will answer our purpose of indicating

the force of the words in their ordinary use and application. Aristotle mentions it among the difficult questions in morals, "Whether to a man who has been (λυτρωθεὶς) *ransomed;* from a company of banditti, (τὸν λυσάμενον ἀντιλυτρωτέον) it is a duty to ransom in return the person who had before ransomed him, whosoever he might be, or to repay the amount to that person, supposing him to require it; at the very time when his own father had been taken, and the sum of money, being all that the person had, was wanted for his (the father's) redemption." (*Ethic. Nicom. lib. i. cap. ii.*) Diodorus says, of the inhabitants of the Balearic isles, that "when any of their females are carried off by pirates making a descent on their shores, they (ἀντὶ μιᾶς γυναικὸς γ. ἢ δ. ἄνδρας διδόντες λυτροῦνται) will give three or four men in ransom for one woman." (*Diod. Sicul. lib. v. cap. xvii.*) He relates that Hercules "released Melanippe, (ἀπελύτρωσεν, ἀντιλαβὼν τὸν ζωστῆρα) taking her girdle as the price of her ransom." (*lib. iv. cap. xvi.*) Similar instances are contained in other passages of this author, whose age and style number him among such Greek writers as approach the most nearly to the language of the New Testament.

These examples will lead us at once to the right conception of the sense of the terms in the New Testament declarations. "The Son of Man came,—to give his own life a ransom for many." Matt. xx. 28. "Who gave himself a ransom for

all." 1 Tim. ii. 6. "Who gave himself for us, that he might ransom us from all iniquity," that is, from the state and condition of sin. Tit. ii. 14. "Ye were redeemed — with the precious blood of Christ." 1 Pet. i. 18. "Justified freely, by his grace, through the redemption which is by Christ Jesus." Rom. iii. 24. "Christ—made unto us from God — redemption." 1 Cor. i. 30. "By whom we have the redemption, through his blood; the forgiveness of our offences." Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. "Through his own blood,—having obtained eternal redemption." Heb. ix. 12. "Death being inflicted, in order to the redemption of the transgressions which were under the first covenant." v. 15. Here ἀπολύτρωσις is rendered by Michaelis *expiation* or *atonement*. See above, page 113. The great Ernesti translates the verse thus:— "And on that account also he is, and is declared, Mediator of the new covenant, in order that, by the intervening of death to atone for sins which could not be expiated under the first covenant, believers might receive the possession of eternal life." Schleusner thinks that the reference is to the sins of the believing Hebrews before their conversion.*

* The instances in which the terms are used in a more large and general signification, appear to be these: Λυτροῦσθαι· Luke xxiv. 21. Λύτρωσις· i. 68. ii. 38. Απολύτρωσις· xxi. 28· Rom. viii. 23. Eph. i. 14. iv. 30. Heb. xi. 35. Λυτρωτής· Acts vii. 35.

There is another class of passages in which the metaphor is represented by ἀγοράζειν *to buy* and ἐξαγοράζειν *to buy back again*, or often simply *to buy*, but with a frequent application to the redemption of captives. "Ye are not your own: for ye are bought with a price of great value;" (τιμῆς, very properly so rendered by De Sacy, Le Cène, Michaelis, and Van Ess.) 1 Cor. vi. 20. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, becoming the curse instead of us." Gal. ii. 13. For the reason of the omission of the article, though κατάρα is definite, see *Bishop Middleton on the Greek Article*, p. 62—66. "Ὑπερ with a genitive, *over*, *for*, *on account of*, *in the name* or *in the room* of another." *Schneider's Wörterbuch*. "Made under the law, that he might redeem those [who were] under the law." iv. 5. "Thou wast slain (ἐσφάγης, strictly *slaughtered*, the word commonly used to denote the slaying of sacrifices:) and thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." Rev. v. 9. "The redeemed from the earth:—the redeemed from men." xiv. 3, 4.

A form of expression, which is so frequently and solemnly employed in "the oracles of God," cannot, however figurative it may be, but have suitableness and wisdom in it. The impious ridicule which some persons are in the habit of throwing upon it, who still would be called Christians, ought to excite our pity for them, but not for a moment deter us from making full use of it,

provided we transgress not the sobriety and chasteness of scripture. A little reflection may shew us that the metaphor rests upon very just and instructive analogies, and that it involves no suppositions inconsistent with the attributes of God, or the dignity of sacred things.

That the idea of something sordid and degrading should be associated with that of pecuniary accuracy, is one of the affectations of a corrupt state of society. Justice in commutation was one of the earliest, the plainest, and the most familiar cases of exact righteousness between man and man; and would therefore very naturally grow into an established metaphor to denote EQUITY, both in particular cases and in the abstract. Hence also, forms of speech could not but be derived, and extended to the whole range of moral obligation. The obedience of the members of a community to the laws and to the public organ of their administration, would be readily described as a *debt due* from each individual to the government; so long as the government maintained its title to obedience, by its own fidelity to the general good. From the language of pecuniary payments probably all nations have formed their customary terms, for expressing the *suit and service* and *all manner of dues*, which are *owing* from every private member of the community to its legal head. It is also obvious that these dues may, by negligence, evasion, or rebellion, be withheld, in part or

entirely. In such case, since the original obligation not only is not cancelled, but does not sustain the smallest abatement, it is equally obvious that there accrues an *accumulation* of obligation: and how could this state of things be represented better than by the language of commercial or pecuniary engagement? This mode of expression would be rendered still more appropriate by the fact, that a material part of the dues claimed by the wisest and best human governments, is required and paid in money, as being the most convenient instrument of exchange for procuring all other commodities and services. Let it be further considered, that the practice of attaching the persons of debtors, especially on public suit, either as a means of procuring payment or as a punishment for dishonesty, has been generally established in civilized societies; and that such a provision, under proper modifications, appears essential to any efficient system of national law.

In reference to the other source of the metaphor, it is sufficient to observe that, in ancient warfare, the lives of prisoners taken were held to be at the disposal of the conqueror; and that the acceptance of a ransom, to buy back the life and liberty of the prisoner, became generally established, when barbarous maxims were somewhat weakened, and considerations of policy and mercy began to take a permanent hold upon the minds of men.

Upon these foundations the scriptural metaphor

under consideration is built; and it was strengthened and made the more familiar and expressive by some parts of the Hebrew code, particularly the law of inheritances. It followed that the language thus established was currently applied to any signal interposition of the power and mercy of the Most High, for the deliverance of men from trouble and misery. Numerous examples occur in the Old Testament, referring to the deliverances from Egypt, from the Babylonish captivity, and from other national oppressions.* I shall cite only one example. "I am Jehovah, thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour. I give Egypt for thy ransom, Cush and Seba in thy stead. Since thou art dear in my sight, highly esteemed, and I love thee; therefore I will give men in thy stead, and nations instead of thy life." Is. xliii. 3, 4.† Here the ideas of deliverance, ransom, and

* For instance; Exod. xv. 13. Deut. xv. 15. Is. lii. 2.

† "A figurative mode of speech, used also in our European languages. When a calamity, which appeared impending over a nation, or had already begun to affect it, actually falls upon another; it is said, that the one became a sacrifice for the other. Stripped of its figure the meaning of the verse is this: *Thou shalt be delivered from thy present calamity, but Egypt shall on this very account be overwhelmed with calamity.* This took place under the Persian monarchy, which was eminently favourable to the Jews. Cyrus granted them their return to the land of their fathers, and permitted them to rebuild their city and temple. The following kings protected them, in this undertaking, against their enemies, who endea-

substitution are plainly developed. Our Lord also repeatedly represents the forgiveness of sins by the image of remitting debts. Matt. vi. 12. Luke vii. 41—48. The justness of both the metaphors will be apparent from a little consideration.

The holy and righteous government of God cannot connive at sin, in its commission; nor can interpose, by measures of mere will and power, to cut off its entail of just and necessary consequences. But the obligations of sinners to obedience are not in the least degree relaxed by the fact of their disobedience. Their repugnance to the law of God, their rooted unwillingness to

voured to hinder the slowly proceeding work. Those monarchs also gave them many munificent presents out of the royal treasury; and the Jews never enjoyed such a long duration of peace and prosperity, even in their best times, as they possessed through the two hundred years that they lived under the Persians. No war came within their borders, they worshipped the One God, as his peculiar people, they were objects of favour to the Persian rulers, and probably the example of this nation, which made so grand a figure upon the theatre of the world, had the effect of entirely taking away the propensity of the Jews to idolatry. But the case was altogether the reverse with Egypt. To that country, the Persian dominion was to the last degree oppressive. Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, conquered it, and treated the vanquished people very harshly. He even ordered the bodies of their kings to be dug out of the repositories of the dead, and to be burned. Yet the burning was no indignity, for it was agreeable to the Persian manners and laws. See Herodotus, Book III. chap. xv." *Michaelis Uebers. u. Anmerk.*

comply with his reasonable requirements, can effect no diminution of their duty. That debt is still owing, and is ever accumulating; while there is also the tremendous *addition* of another obligation, the obligation to abide by the effects of disobedience, as already incurred. This state of twofold obligation is an evident result of the laws of intellectual and moral nature, and the revealed law of the Impartial Ruler, who will "do right" in every respect. No powers of their own can exonerate sinful beings from this state of obligation. The original claim, and the consequences of having violated it, continue to press upon them. But judgment is not immediately enforced. The forbearing mercy of God grants time, and respites execution. The state of waiting, while as yet the awful effects of sin have not fully disclosed themselves, has an obvious resemblance to the state of a captive detained by his enemy, or a debtor in prison, or a convicted criminal chained in his condemned cell.

These images somewhat vary from each other; and it would require neither wit nor talent, in any profane man, to turn them into burlesque: but the general features are obvious and accordant. Man is insolvent, condemned, and a captive. The detaining power is the Justice of the Divine Government, and a wise regard to the public good. The state of sin involves an actual slavery of the soul. It is captivated and fettered, misled

and abused, by criminal passions. There is also another fact, which adds still further to the propriety and instructive character of this class of metaphors. The state of sin includes a real subjection to the dominion and influence of wicked spirits. The grounds, from both philosophy and revelation, for believing the existence of superior orders of intelligent creatures, and that some of these have become irreclaimably wicked, need not here be stated. That such beings should be both able and disposed to use their powers for the injury of human creatures, is not antecedently more incredible than the existence of deleterious effects on the health and life of men, from the conditions of the atmosphere, and innumerable other physical causes, which science cannot controul or even comprehend; or that of a malignant influence, often terminating in utter perdition, exercised by some wicked men upon others, in the various forms of temptation to sin. Hence the principal of these evil beings (who is, by a common and natural metonymy, often mentioned singly when the design of the writer is to include the whole army of his fellow-conspirators,) is called "the god of this world, the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience, filling their hearts, deceiving and beguiling them, and leading them captive;" and the entire system of this seducing and enslaving influence is called "the power of darkness, the kingdom of Satan." Between this leader

of evil and his victims, there is an identity of moral principles, a conformity of character, an agreement in the choice of an end and in the use of means to reach it: they are his willing victims.

In this sense I conceive it is, that "the devil" is said to "have the power of death." Of natural and temporal death he was the remoter cause, having been the seducer of mortals to sin; and "death entered into the world by sin." But of death in its most ample and terrible sense, the death of the soul, the loss of happy being, "the eternal death," this "murderer from the beginning" is the *chieftain;* the first in the guilt and condemnation, and maliciously labouring to seduce others into the same ruin, that he may then taunt and tyrannize over these confederates in rebellion, and partakers in its consequent wretchedness.

Is it not then with the greatest propriety, that the work of mercy, in delivering any of mankind from this dreadful thraldrom, is represented as an emancipation out of the power of a cruel tyrant, by the hand of a stronger than he? And that, since this exercise of power is made in righteousness, the deliverance should be referred to the *ground* of that righteousness in the sacrifice of Christ? "The Father hath delivered us from the power of darkness and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.—To open their

eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

In another passage, the great deliverance of the gospel is represented by both the figures in conjunction, *the cancelling of a debt* (which was anciently signified by driving a nail through the bond or deed of obligation) and *the emancipating of captives* by the conquest of their oppressors and a triumph over them. It must also be brought to mind, that the ceremonial ordinances of the Mosaic law were a perpetual memorial of sin as involving exposure to punishment, and of the inability of a sinner to effect his own deliverance; so that their abolition amounted to a declaration that an effectual provision was now made for the pardon of sin by the Righteous Judge, and for the everlasting deliverance of those who had been the slaves of sin and the captives of wicked spirits. "And you, who were dead [in your moral state and by the sentence of the law] in your offences and in the uncircumcision of your flesh [your state of alienation from the revelation of divine mercy in the Israelitish dispensation,] God hath made alive with him [*i. e.* Christ,] having forgiven you all your trespasses; having blotted out the hand-writing [*chirograph*, the ancient term for a deed of pecuniary obligation,] in the ordinances, which stood against us, which was opposed to us; and took it completely away by nailing it to his cross: having despoiled principalities and powers, he dis-

played them openly, triumphing over them by it." Col. ii. 13—15.

Again; let us ask, What idea had the apostle when he supposed the case of some one dying for a righteous man? Was it not the undergoing of this suffering, that the person intended to be benefited might be released from it? Now it is plainly with a similar view that Christ is there declared to have "died for us, when we were yet sinners,"—"without strength,"—that is in the state of our dreadful fall, stunned as it were and lying in a helpless and perishing condition. But from *what* are believers in Christ released by his death? Not from corporal death; for that they all do and must endure, without any distinction, as to the physical suffering, from the rest of mankind. The evil, shown to be so unspeakably tremendous, and from which the deliverance could be effected only in this astonishing manner, must therefore have been something different from natural death and incomparably more dreadful. But there is no other greater evil, to which the argument can possibly be applied, except that which the apostle *actually affirms;* SIN, and its penal consequence WRATH, that is, the punishment of sin determined, not by arbitrary dominion, but by the incorruptible and unerring justice of God. "When we were still fallen, Christ at the destined time died for us as guilty persons. Scarcely would any one die for an innocent person (though perhaps, to die for a

very good and beneficent person, some one might once take up the hard resolution,) but God demonstrates his love towards us in that, when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. How much more then shall we now, after that we have been declared righteous on account of his blood, be, through him, saved and made free from punishment? For if, though we were still enemies, we have been reconciled to God through the death of His Son, how much more shall we, as being already reconciled, be saved through his life? And not that merely, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the reconciliation."*

These considerations are, I trust, sufficient to show that whatever means have been appointed by the wisdom and mercy of God, as fit and efficient to render this great deliverance compatible with the rectitude of his government, may be most properly and justly expressed by the payment of a debt or of a ransom-price, and by the intervention of a power exercised in righteousness.

We need not, therefore, to be afraid or ashamed to use these scriptural metaphors, provided we

* Rom. v. 6—11. Here given in a close rendering from Michaelis's translation, published in 1790, the year before his death: and I have here adopted it, not merely on account of so great an authority, but because it is a most faithful representation of the original.

keep within the sobriety of scripture-precedent. But it must be confessed that ignorance, bad taste, and weak judgment, find a great facility in using them extravagantly and driving them to excess. Of this folly and mischief many of the Christian fathers, were guilty, to a degree which would appear almost incredible, if recited to well instructed Christians in modern times. The declamations of those who are deemed Antinomians and enthusiasts among us, are sober and decent, in comparison with some passages of those early writers, who are often extolled as if they had possessed an authority approaching to that of inspiration, and to whom even some Protestants advise us to look, as our best guides for the interpretation of scripture, and as the safe depositaries of apostolic doctrine.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

AND

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Note I. page 5.

Human Sacrifices. An account of the nations that used these horrid rites is in *Grotius de Satisf. Christi, cap.* x. A more detailed and interesting statement occurs in the valuable work (one of his *best*) of our great nonconformist divine *Dr. John Owen, de Natura, &c. Veræ Theol.* cap. viii. § 33—41. A profusion of facts and authorities with regard to almost every part of the earth, is in *M. Beyer's Addit. Seldeni Lib. de Diis Syris;—Moloch; Saubertus de Sacrificiis Veterum,* cap. xxi.; and in *Dr. Magee's* very valuable work on *Atonement and Sacrifice,* Diss. V. which not only supplies many ancient instances, but is particularly copious with regard to the extensive prevalence of these cruelties in modern nations. The sum of the evidence from the almost innumerable witnesses, may be given in the words of Cicero, concerning the ancient Gauls.—"When, alarmed by any cause of terror, they think that their gods must be appeased, they pollute their altars and temples with human sacrifices! Under pretence of religion they violate its very first dictates! Is it not notorious, that, to this day, they retain that horrid and savage practice of immolating their fellow creatures?" *Or.*

pro M. Fonteio, § 10. But in revolting atrocity, the bad pre-eminence seems due to a rite of the Thessalians recorded by Lucan, in words too shocking to be translated:

> Nec refugit caedes, vivum si sacra cruorem,
> Extaque funereæ poscunt trepidantia mensæ:
> Volnere sic ventris, non, qua natura vocabat,
> Extrahitur partus, calidis ponendus in aris.
>
> PHARSAL. VI. 556.

Note II. page 5.

SOCINIAN VIEWS OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST. "This way of representing the death of Christ was adapted to conciliate the prejudices of the Hebrew Christians." *Impr. Vers. of N. T. Note on Heb.* vii. 27. "Did the Jews pride themselves in their temple, their altar, their sacrifices, and their high-priest, the writer of this epistle finds in the Christian system a temple, an altar, a sacrifice, and an high-priest, superior to their's, so that the former were only types of what followed. But as I have frequently observed, though arguments of this kind were calculated to make an impression upon Jews, they are not only of no use to us, who have no Jewish prejudices to remove, but if we be not upon our guard, they may mislead us, by teaching us to look for something more than a figurative resemblance in them." *Dr. Priestley's Notes; Heb.* iv. 13. No wonder that Dr. P. should have felt himself compelled to premise, that this "part of the epistle is not particularly edifying to us." The sequel of the note only shews that the writer conceived of the sentiment which he labours to explode, in a manner to which, I believe, most consistent Calvinists strongly object. May I hope that the preceding pages have shewn our doctrine of redemption and satisfaction to be very different from that which is commonly imputed to us, by our theological adversaries? At the

same time, it must be confessed, that some of our writers and preachers, whether ignorantly, or inadvertently, or indulging a poetical fancy, have given too much occasion for those misconceptions. It is one advantage resulting from the unpleasing toils of religious controversy, that it leads us to examine our principles more carefully, and to state them more correctly.

Note III. page 11.

ORIGIN OF SACRIFICES. It is acknowledged that we have only circumstantial, and therefore indirect, evidence for ascribing to sacrifices the origin of a divine institution; but that this evidence amounts to a very high degree of probability, and even to a moral certainty, may, I conceive, be argued upon the following grounds.

i. *The improbability of an origin in human judgment or feeling.* We admit that the conceptions of the earliest tribes of mankind concerning THE DIVINE BEING, were tinctured with anthropomorphism;* and that, therefore, the idea of a a present to the Author of good, as an acknowledgment of his bounty, was not unlikely to arise in the minds of men who, though in a condition of intellect and divinely communicated knowledge, widely different from the degenerate state of savage life, yet could not but be far from those purely spiritual conceptions which Christianity has diffused. But the occurrence of such an idea would naturally confine itself to the presentation of fruits and flowers. The violent death of an innocent and interesting animal, its cries, its agonies, its blood and mangled remains, could not but form a repulsive object, most

* Evidence of this is contained in those primitive documents of history and inspiration, Noachic or possibly even antediluvian, which Moses has either incorporated into his own narrative or prefixed to it. For example; Gen. i. 8, 12, &c. the language of satisfaction at the result of an experiment, and importing a previous uncertainty;—ii. 2. repose from labour;—v. 8.—vi. 5.—viii. 1, 21.

distressing to the feelings, and altogether alien from the grateful ideas supposed. Nor does there appear any natural transition from the former to the latter kind of offering, but obvious sentiments of reason and feeling are opposed to such a transition.

Some have supposed that sacrifices originated in the idea of a friendly meal, and that the Deity was considered as, by this means, sitting down at table with his worshippers, and feasting with them. That this notion obtained a footing in the opinions of heathenism, is sufficiently probable: but we have no authority for attaching it to the sacrifices recorded in the earliest scriptures; and it is opposed by the fact, that the principal *sacrifice of expiation* was the holocaust, or "whole burnt offering," of which no part was eaten, but the whole consumed by the fire upon the altar.

ii. There are *rational arguments* in favour of attributing the origin of sacrifices to divine authority and injunction. I cannot set this position in a clearer light than by quoting from Dr. Patrick Delany. "A plain truth, which no candid reader will, I believe, contest, is this; that *whatever practice obtains universally in the world, for any considerable number of years, must obtain in it either from some dictate of* REASON, *or some demand of* NATURE, *or some principle of* INTEREST, *or some powerful influence or* INJUNCTION *of some Being of universal authority.* Now, that Sacrifices obtained universally, for many ages, over all the regions of the known world, will not be denied by any man who makes the least pretence to the knowledge of antiquity. That the practice did not obtain from any dictate of *Reason*, the adversaries of revelation will, I believe, readily own; it being evident that unprejudiced reason never could antecedently dictate, that destroying the best of our fruits and creatures could be an office acceptable to God; but quite the contrary. That it did not prevail from any demand of *Nature* is undeniable; for, I believe, no man will say that we have any natural instinct or appetite to gratify,

in spilling the blood of an innocent inoffensive creature upon the earth, or burning his body upon an altar. Nor could there be any temptation from appetite to do this, in those ages when the whole sacrifice was consumed by fire;* or when, if it were not, yet men wholly abstained from flesh :—consequently, this practice did not owe its origin to any principle of *Interest*, and so there could be no priestcraft in the case.—In after ages, the duty of sacrificing belonged to the father of the family, who was more interested in the well-being of it than any other person whatsoever, and consequently could have no interest in creating an unnecessary expence.—When fathers grew up into princes,—sacrifices were then also at the sacrificer's own expence.—Libations, and offerings of several kinds, were the constant practice of private men in their own families; and priests had no perquisites from them." [The author goes on to shew the groundlessness of the pretence, that sacrificing was a rite invented by any order of men, to serve their own cupidity at the expense of others.] "Since then sacrifices are demonstrably not the invention of priestcraft, nor the dictate of reason, nor the demand of nature; I should be glad that infidels would so much as attempt to tell us, with any colour of reason and proof, how they prevailed so universally in the world, *otherwise than from* DIVINE APPOINTMENT.—How any practice could obtain in the world, to which mankind were neither urged by the *interest* and subtlety of any particular set of men, nor by any dictate of *reason*, nor by any instinct or demand of *nature*, nor by any interest of any kind; but quite the contary, *in direct contradiction* to every principle of reason and nature and interest (for the destruction of innocent and useful creatures is so—); I say, how such a practice could prevail, and prevail universally, is

* All the accounts of sacrifices which we have in the Scriptures, prior to the institution of the Mosaic Law, confirm the opinion that no sacrifices were practised but holocausts.

impossible to be accounted for but from some powerful and irresistible influence of *example*, or injunction of AUTHORITY. And what example could have such influence except that of Adam, or what authority could have such power except that of GOD, is to me utterly inconceivable." *Revelation examined with Candour*; vol. i. p. 127—132. London, 1735.

iii. We argue from the *scripture account of the first sacrifice*. Having briefly urged this in the Discourse, I shall here adduce the corroborating statements of writers, whose acute sagacity, extensive knowledge, and likelihood of being free from what some call orthodox prejudices, entitle them to peculiar regard. I begin with the sensible author just cited: though it is worth observation that Calvin, in his comment on Gen. iv. 2; had brought forwards the same arguments.

"— Heb. xi. 4. Gen. iv. 3—7. In these words it is plainly implied that Abel acted 'well' i. e. righteously, in the business of his sacrifice; and that Cain acted 'not well' i. e. unrighteously, in the business of his sacrifice; and that, in consequence of this defect, 'sin lay at his door.' Now this righteousness in Abel, by which he obtained the preference to his brother, the apostle ascribes to his 'faith.'—Here we see that, according to the Scripture account, the first act of *worship which God accepted* with open marks of approbation, was a *sacrifice*, in which the life of one of his creatures was devoutly offered up to him; and that what made it acceptable was the *faith* of the offerer. In this account are contained two points:—(1.) That *sacrifice* was, from the beginning, *acceptable to God*; and (2.) That *Faith made it so*.—Nothing is more absurd than to imagine that God could ever be gratified or appeased by the destruction of his creatures: and, if this action could not in its own nature be acceptable to God, how could faith make it so?—[It has been shewn] that God gave Abel sure proof of his acceptance of his sacrifice, and also gave testimony of his having 'done well' in that act of adoration. Hence, I clearly infer that *sacrifices were of divine*

institution. For it is certain that the destruction of an innocent creature is not, *in itself*, an action acceptable to God; and therefore nothing but *duty* could make it acceptable; and nothing but *the command of God* could make it a duty in the case before us. Nothing but God's command could create a *right* to take away the lives [of his creatures.] It is also evident that killing an innocent creature cannot, in its own nature, be properly said to be 'doing well.' And therefore, since Abel is acknowledged by God to have 'done well' in killing the firstlings of his flock in sacrifice, it is evident that he must have done this for some *very good and just reason:* and what reason could justify him in doing it but the command of God? No action is just or good otherwise than *as it is conformable to the will of God,* either revealed or established in the nature of things: [but, that such an action as this] was conformable to the divine will could only be known by *revelation,* i. e. by being commanded; therefore the rectitude of it could only arise from *obedience;* and obedience could justify it.—Again; the apostle assures us that 'Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by faith;' and what this faith is, he explains in some following instances.—[Noah;—Abraham;—Sarah.—] What then was this faith,—but obedience to the commands of God, and a firm trust and confidence in the assurances which HE gave them, however seemingly improbable and unlikely to be fulfilled? And can we have any doubt that Abel's faith also consisted in obedience and an assurance of being acceptable by that obedience, though in an act of duty otherwise most unlikely to be pleasing to God? [For so] that of the destruction of his innocent creatures certainly was; an action than which nothing could be, in appearance, more ill fitted to appease the divine wrath or obtain the divine favour. And yet, a ready obedience to that great Being who commanded it, made the action and the actor righteous. It is also evident, that nothing but *such a faith* as prompted Abel to that obedience ever could make

such an action acceptable to God, in any man whatsoever, from the foundation of the world." *Delaney*, vol. i. p. 135—138.

" — It is easy to be demonstrated that Sacrifices owed their original to the *Will* and *Appointment* of GOD. The apostle expressly says, as Moses said before him, that Abel's sacrifice was *accceptable* to God. But it would not have been acceptable, if it had not been of divine institution; according to that plain, obvious, and eternal maxim of all true religion, Christian, Mosaic, and natural, 'In vain do they worship God, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Mark vii. 7. If there be any truth in this maxim, Abel would have worshipped God in vain; and God would have had no respect to his offering, if his sacrificing had been merely a commandment of his father Adam, or an invention of his own. The divine *acceptance*, therefore, is a demonstration of a divine *institution*. If any reader is not yet convinced, I would desire him to say why he does not now offer up a bullock, a sheep, or a pigeon, according to his ability, as a thank-offering to God and a testimony of his gratitude to the divine goodness, after a recovery from a dangerous disease, after a remarkable deliverance in any other kind, or as an evidence of the just apprehensions which he has of the demerit of sin. The true reason why he will not do it himself is, because he cannot know that God will accept such will-worship, and so he concludes that he should herein worship God in vain. From hence he may certainly infer that, since Abel did not sacrifice in vain, it was not will-worship, but a divine appointment." *Hallett's Continuation of Peirce on the Ep. to the Hebrews*, p. 12.

To these luminous reasonings we may add the supposition, not destitute of probability, though in an inferior degree, that the way in which "God had respect unto Abel and to his offering," (Gen. iv. 4.) was by fire from heaven, that is by a flash of lightening descending upon and kindling the faggots

upon the altar. The Hebrew verb denotes *to look with a rapid and keen glance of the eye*, indicating great earnestness. It may seem, therefore, to have been with some propriety that Theodotion, the Marcionite Greek translator in the second century, rendered by ἐνεπύρισεν, *he kindled*, or *set on fire*. Upon this Jerome remarks; "Unde scire poterat Cain quod fratris ejus munera suscepisset Deus et sua repudiasset, nisi illa interpretatio vera est quam Theodotio posuit? Et inflammavit Deus super Abel et super sacrificium ejus; super Cain verò et super sacrificium ejus non inflammavit." *Quæstiones Hebr. in Gen. Opera*, tom. iii. p. 379. Col. 1616. "How could Cain know that God accepted his brother's offering and rejected his own, unless the translation which Theodotion has given be the true one?—and God sent down fire upon Abel and upon his sacrifice; but upon Cain and upon his sacrifice he did not send down fire." Some of the most judicious of the Jewish Rabbis hold this interpretation. Grotius sanctions it. Leclerc mentions it with approbation, and adds, "Certainly, that this phænomenon took place in following periods of time, no one can doubt who reads Levit. ix. 24. Judges vi. 21. 1 Kings xxiii. 38. 2 Chron. vii. 1. If it was not by this particular token that Abel understood that God was propitious to him, it must have been by some other equally indubitable." *Comment. in loc.* The younger Rosenmüller gives it, without hesitation or exception, as the sense of the passage; "God accepted Abel's offering; which appears to have been manifested by fire from heaven, as took place in subsequent times."

On the other hand, J. D. Michaelis says, "I cannot but greatly doubt whether this took place by fire from heaven, which, according to a very general opinion, kindled and consumed Abel's offering. We can scarcely suppose that Moses would be silent upon such an extraordinary sign of the divine favour; at least we should act strangely, if we believed such an extraordinary thing without proof. It does not appear that the Apostle Paul had any idea of such a visible and

anticipating demonstration of the divine acceptance of Abel's offering; for, in that case, the example would not have borne a perfectly happy application to its purpose, as he is treating upon faith in that which is invisible or future. I rather think, upon this point, that God had visibly blessed Abel in his pastoral occupations, and had thus shewn his gracious acceptance of the thank-offering which had been brought at the end of the year; while Cain, on the contrary, had met with various kinds of misfortune in his agriculture, which would be to him a more powerful temptation to murmuring against God and envy against his brother, than a momentary flash of fire from the sky." *Erklärung des Briefes an die Hebräer;* p. 301. Frankfort, 1762. "It is usually asked, how Cain could know that God graciously regarded his brother's offering, and not his own. I answer that it was probably from God's conferring great success the following year upon Abel's occupation in cattle, while his own field-labour turned out ill. They had both brought their offerings, to implore the blessing of God upon their respective occupations; and he who received this blessing would appear to be the person whose offering God accepted." *Uebersetzung des A. T. mit Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte,* ii. theil. Anm. p. 25. Göttingen, 1770.

Ingenious as these remarks are, I conceive that a just reply may be given to them. Certainly there is no objection to the idea that even a considerable time might elapse, between the offerings and Cain's murderous revenge; and there might be an observable difference of the divine providence towards the righteous brother and the wicked one. But all this forms no objection to the supposition of the miraculous enkindling. The argument of the apostle upon Abel's faith refers to his state of mind previously to the sacrifice, and is, therefore, in no respect prejudiced by any opinion upon the way in which God testified his approbation. Neither can we draw an adverse conclusion from the silence of Moses. Both he and the other scriptural historians omit the definite mention of

circumstances innumerable and important, but the occurrence of which is beyond a doubt implied. Besides there is much weight in Delaney's observations: "The Jews knew very well that their own sacrifices were of divine institution, and that God manifested his acceptance of them, upon the first solemn oblation after that institution, by miraculous fire from the divine presence (Lev. ix. 24.); and they could have no reason to doubt that they were so instituted and so accepted, from the beginning: nor needed they to be then informed of a truth which, doubtless, a clear uninterrupted tradition had long made familiar to them." *Rev. Exam.* i. 140.

iv. We have evidence of the practice of animal sacrificing, as the most solemn act of worship, by the patriarchs to whom divine communications were habitually made. Noah, the second common ancestor of our race, on the greatest and most affecting occasion, offered that kind of sacrifice which possessed the highest weight and dignity, as denoting both expiation and gratitude. Gen. viii. 20. The passage peculiarly dwells upon its acceptableness to God: and this could not have been without a knowledge of its divine appointment. The reference to the offering of sacrifices in the histories of Abraham and Jacob, plainly indicate that it was the known and accredited method of honouring the Deity, and of procuring expiation for sin. The expiatory design of sacrifices, and the divine approbation of them with that view, could not be more plainly expressed than in the Book of Job, ch. i. 5. xlii. 8. In all these instances, confidence in the acceptance of God is clearly implied: but such confidence could not have existed without a divine warrant, and a divine warrant either is a divine institution or presupposes one. Universal knowledge and tradition, concerning the original divine institution, sufficiently account for the occurrence of no specific mention of it in the brief records of the antediluvian and patriarchal history.

The late Mr. Mitford conceived that the rite of sacrificing was prescribed by the merciful Jehovah to our first parents,

upon their fall, in order to teach them the preparation of animal flesh for food, and to overcome the repugnance which they could not but feel at such a new and revolting mode of sustaining their own lives. Referring to Gen. iv. 4. he says, "Sacrifice, without any previous notice of such a rite, is mentioned in clear terms and as an established duty of man, and as the means still graciously afforded by the Creator of immediate communication with himself.—It seems to me enough implied that, with the institution of the rite of sacrifice, the grant, in a following part of Scripture distinctly stated, of every inferior animal as lawful food for man, was made to Adam on his removal from paradise.—The rite of burnt offering was to hallow the meal of meat ensuing; for it is abundantly marked in Scripture and by heathen writers, that the sacrifice among both Jews and Gentiles always afforded a meal." Thus the learned author supposed that the Deity introduced man to a kind of food which his altered circumstances now rendered necessary, but which must have appeared "disgusting both in preparation and use:" and that also some religious benefit was intended; for, by duly attending to this painful and humiliating process, and its obvious suggestions of moral instruction, man would make use of "this very rite of burnt offering, with all its degrading circumstances, for the exercise of his high moral privilege, peculiar to himself among surrounding animals, of communicating with his Creator." *Observations on the History and Doctrine of Christianity, by the late William Mitford, Esq.* the author of the History of Greece; pp. 48—51. quoted in the *Monthly Repos. New Series*, vol. I. p. 214. 1827. I submit these remarks.

1. The language of Scripture is decidedly in favour of the commonly received opinion, that the permission of animal food was not given by the Lord of all, till after the deluge. Compare Gen. i. 21. with ix. 3. If mankind had been directed to kill animals for food, immediately upon the fall, it would

have appeared like giving a reward for disobedience, as the previous donation remained in full force, of suitable fruits and herbs, in all their variety, and as a short time would suffice for overcoming the repugnance, and producing proofs of the agreeableness and salubrity of animal food duly prepared. Besides, as Michaelis observes, had men used such food from the first, when as yet the serviceable animals had not sufficiently multiplied their numbers, there would have been danger of an extirpation of some of the most valuable species. It might be replied that a very few years would be sufficient to provide against that danger: but this concession would not help Mr. Mitford's conjecture, which is that animal food was granted by God immediately upon the entrance of sin and misery into the world.

2. The hypothesis involves the principal fact, that sacrifices were not a human invention but an express institution of God.

3. It also admits that they had an instructive and religious object. They were not solely to sanction and recommend animal food, but, by the distressing and "degrading circumstances" with which its procurement was intended, to promote humiliation and repentance, and to be a means of mercy and grace in the communication of man with his Creator. Undoubtedly Mr. Mitford meant, by acts of spiritual devotion.

4. The learned author is greatly in error when he says that, "amongst both Jews and Gentiles, the sacrifice always afforded a meal." The עלה, commonly rendered *burnt offering*, in the LXX. ὁλοκαύτωμα, was a very frequent kind of sacrifice under the Hebrew law, and probably *the most frequent* in earlier times; and it was *entirely consumed* by fire upon the altar. It is the word used in the history of the earliest recorded sacrifices, after that of Abel; namely, in the instance of Noah, Gen. viii. 20. Abraham, xx. 7, 8, 13. Job, ch. i. 5. and, in the ceremonial precepts of Moses, the examples are extremely numerous indeed. See particularly Lev. i. 1—13.

where it is plain that *this* was the great and chief kind of sacrifice. The general term מנחה, used concerning the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, merely denotes *a present*, and is used in application to every kind of sacrifice; so that we cannot from it conclude that Abel's offering was not a whole burnt offering. With regard to the Gentiles, Mr. Mitford's assertion is equally inaccurate. It is surprising that he who had read so much Greek, should not have recollected the passage in Hesiod (*Theogonia*, v. 521—560.) which represents Prometheus as having offended Jupiter by innovating upon the practice of offering the whole animal, and reserving the best parts of it for food. See also Hyginus, in his Astron. Poet. ii. 15. and *Saubertus de Sacrificiis Veterum*, p. 430.

5. If we were to admit all that Mr. Mitford asserts, it would by no means militate against our sentiment; but would indeed give additional establishment to it. He affirms the divine institution of sacrifice, and that religious lessons were represented by it: then why should not those lessons have included the idea of mercy and pardon for the offences of the offerer, in some way which the awful sight of a violent death was adapted to represent? The circumstance of partaking of the offering, by food, would strengthen rather than militate against this idea; for it would suggest that, as the eating of a part of the slain victim sustained this transient life, so the benefits of a restored, spiritual, and eternal life, were to be obtained by sinning mortals, through the means of something far more excellent, but yet analogous to the visible sacrifice.

Note IV. page 11.

SKINS OF ANIMALS CONVERTED INTO CLOTHING. "We have here probably a Divine Institution of Sacrifices. At least sacrifices were soon afterwards brought by Cain and Abel: and the essence of sacrifices consisted in this, that the punishment which the sinner had merited, and which was now

to him remitted or respited, was displayed to him in an animal." *Michaelis Anmerk. zu Gen.* iii. 21.

"Since this exigency [clothing] would likewise be fully answered by sacrifices, which would yield them covering from the skins of the creatures so slain; this is also a new evidence of the wisdom of God in this institution. Nor is there the least reason to doubt that the clothes made for our first parents, by divine appointment, immediately after the fall, were of the skins of the creatures offered up to God on this occasion; for there is no reason to imagine that any of the beasts, which were just made in perfection, should die so soon, or would naturally die in many years after their creation. What could shew the evil of disobedience more strongly, than the groans and struggles of innocent creatures, bleeding to death for his guilt, before his eyes and by his own hands? Sights of this kind are shocking to humanity even yet, though custom hath long made them familiar. With what horror, then, may we imagine they pierced the hearts of our first parents! And how was this horror aggravated, when they considered themselves as the guilty authors of so much cruelty to the beings about them! — And, when the groans and struggles of the dying animals were over, what ghastly and sad sights must the dead eyes and cold carcasses of the creatures yield him, before they were placed upon the altar; and in their ashes after! How dismal a meditation must it be, to consider the beauty and excellence of animated beings, reduced to a handful of dust!—Is it possible to conceive how God could strike the human soul with more sense of misery from guilt, or more abhorrence of the sad cause of that misery, than by this conduct? Such abhorrence of guilt, and such a loathing of life, that, if the mercy of God had not caused some ray of hope to shine through this scene of mortality and misery, it is not to be imagined how Adam and Eve could bear their being: and therefore there seems to be an absolute necessity that, when sacrifices pierced the heart of man with such dread,

and detestation of guilt and misery, they should at the same time be seals to some covenant of mercy from God. That God entered into a covenant of mercy with man, immediately after the fall, is evident from the sentence passed upon the serpent, in which a covenant of mercy is necessarily implied. And can we doubt that sacrifices were the seal of that covenant? Especially when mercy is so plainly implied in the very nature of the institution, which teaches that, though life be the forfeiture of sin, yet God will in mercy accept another life in lieu of the offender's." *Delaney*, i. 148—150.

Note V. page 12.

HEATHEN NOTIONS OF THE INTENTION OF SACRIFICES. That the Greeks and Romans, and other ancient nations of whose religion any sufficient notices have descended to us, believed in the propitiatory effect of sacrifices, is so familiar a fact to all who are conversant with ancient authors, that an induction of instances is as unnecessary, as it would be almost endless. Herodotus tells us (*Euterpe*, § 39,) that the Egyptians believed that the public or private calamities which might be impending, were averted by being "turned upon the head" of the sacrificed victim. Homer and the Greek Tragedians are the most complete authorities for the religious views of their respective times: and that they considered sacrifices to be efficacious to placate the gods and procure the pardon of offences, is abundantly manifest. *Dr. Magee*, in several of his learned and excellent Dissertations, has produced many evidences of the prevalence of this sentiment, among both ancient and modern heathen nations. But he has by no means exhausted the subject. Testimonies innumerable might be added to those which his extensive reading has collected. Many are to be found, accompanied with valuable reasonings, and criticisms, in the last chapter of *Grotius de Satisf. Christi.*

The well known passage in Cæsar's account of the Gaulish tribes, including all the ancient Britons, most plainly declares the belief in a *propitiatory effect* of their numerous immolations of human victims. See *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 16. Some very interesting examples occur in Livy. Horatius, the survivor of the brothers in the combat of the Horatii and Curiatii, was saved by popular acclamation from the death which he had incurred by killing his sister: but it was held necessary that his father should provide an expiation by sacrifices, at the public expence. *Ut cædes manifesta aliquo tamen piaculo lucretur, imperatum patri ut filium expiaret pecunia publica: is, quibusdam piacularibus sacrificiis factis,—&c. Lib.* i. 26. When the elder Decius devoted himself to death for the supposed salvation of his country, he was regarded "as sent by heaven to be an expiation to the wrath of the gods:"—*sicut cælo missus piaculum omnis deorum iræ.* viii. 9. His son, in another public danger, followed his example, exclaiming that "it was granted to their family to be expiations to remove the perils of the state!" x. 28. In similar language is described the intention of Postumius, after the surrender at the Furcæ Caudinæ. ix. 10. Fabius Maximus attributed the successes of Hannibal to the wrath of the gods for his country's crimes, and began his dictatorship by a solemn inquiry what expiations could appease that wrath. xxii. 9. So Scipio pronounces the mutiny of his army to be a crime which "no sacrifices, no supplications, could expiate, but the blood of the offenders." xxviii. 27. So the violation of the sacred treasury at Locri, was held to require an expiatory sacrifice; and the college of priests was to determine what expiations were requisite, to what deities, and with what victims. xxix. 19. Other examples are furnished by the same charming and instructive author. Were one thus to go through all the Greek and Roman historians, the instances would swell to a vast collection: and the earlier are the times to which they belong, the more abundant and striking they are. Thus, in the earliest

ages of mankind, while the impressions of primitive tradition, though so lamentably misapplied, and associated with the characteristic ferocity of polytheism, were not yet abraded by philosophy and civilization,—thus strongly and universally did men recognize that their crimes insured the vengeance of superior powers, except its course was stayed by the atonement of sacrifices, often in a high degree difficult, costly, and terrific. As amidst the errors of idolatry, it is easy to perceive the indelible effects of the primitive belief and worship of the Only God; so, under this mass of corruption, we obviously see the foundation of original truth.

The name of the month February is derived from an old Roman word, *Februa;* which was a general term for sacrifices and ceremonies performed at the close of the year, for the expiation of all the sins of the expiring period. February was the last month in the ancient Roman year, in which it was "held an essential part of filial duty, to make atonement on the behalf of our parents, by a sacrifice of the greatest value." *Cicero de Legibus,* ii. 21. See the curious information of Ovid on the early religion of the Romans; *Fasti,* ii. 20—50. where among other interesting particulars, he says, "The fathers of the Roman state called expiations *Februa:*—In fine, whatever is a mean of atonement for our souls (*quo pectora nostra piamur,*) our unpolished ancestors called by this name:—Such expiations they believed would take away every sin and every cause of calamity." To the same effect the following remarkable passage is produced by Grotius from Pliny; [At vereor ne virum summum memoria fefellerit, mihi enim utriusque Plinii libros diligenter evolventi, loci hujus inveniendi causa, labor male cessit:] "From early times the ancient opinion has prevailed, that all observances were (*februa*) expiations, by which the consciences of sinners could be purged, and their sins blotted out; (*conscientiæ purgarentur, delerenturque peccata.*) *Ap. Grot. de Sat.* c, x.

Note VI. page 12.

PYTHAGOREANS, &c. "Pythagoricorum factio hanc cum DEO unionem fieri posse statuit per purgationem animæ et corporis; hanc vero purgationem alii ex iis διὰ τῶν θυσιῶν καὶ τοῦ θυηπολικοῦ πυρὸς peragi posse sciscunt, quales Jamblichus, Syrianus, et Proclus; alii vero per philosophiam, &c." *Brunneri Diss. de Theol. Nat.* "The sect of the Pythagoræans maintained that this union with God was to be attained by the purification of both mind and body: but this purification some of them conceived might be wrought out by sacrifices and the sacrificial fire, as Jamblichus, Syrianus, and Proclus; but others regarded the doctrines of their philosophy as sufficient to answer this purpose." Those of the disciples of Pythagoras who rejected animal sacrifices, as they did animal food, supported their practice entirely by arguments from humanity and reason, while they yielded the claim of antiquity. Porphyry, in his ingenious Treatise on Abstinence from Animals, sets up the hypothesis that men first offered the fruits of the earth, then *each other*, and lastly the usual animals. *Lib.* ii. 27. He scarcely attempts a reply to the argument in defence of sacrifices, which he cites from Claudius Neapolitanus; that they were founded on immemorial custom and law, "not from the authority of men, but according to the appointment of God." *Lib.* i. 25. A fragment of an uncertain author in Photius affirms, that the Pythagoreans "abstained from animals, and tasted, at the proper season, of *the sacrifices only*." *Biblioth. ed. Hoeschel.* 1612, p. 1313. As for Zaleucus (who was a Pythagorean), Plato, and the elder Platonists, it is very plain, that their objection was not to sacrifices, but to the notion of their sufficiency without a pious mind and personal virtue. See the noble preface to the Laws of Zaleucus, in *Diodorus Siculus*, xii. 20. and the celebrated passage of Plato in the *Alcibiades Secundus*. § 12, 13.

Note VII. page 19.

Religious instruction by the Levites. The opinion here advanced may seem inconsistent with that of Michaelis. He regards the Levites as not merely an order of men set apart for the duties of the sanctuary, but as the general body of persons professing learning in all the faculties; ministers of religion, judges or rather expounders of the law, copyists and guardians of the sacred books, keepers of the genealogical registers, and superintendents of the national standards of weights and measures: and he goes on to say, "We no where find that Moses mentions, even incidentally, any such profession as that of our clergyman, or that he instituted preaching on the sabbath. The Levites cannot be justly compared with our preachers. This class of men, whose importance in a political point of view alone must be acknowledged, if they did nothing else than instruct the common people in morality, was wanting in the constitution of the Mosaic state and church. So, likewise, the priests of the gods in other nations were occupied, not in instruction, but in sacrifices and ceremonies. A body of teachers of religion, properly so called, did not exist among the Jews until after the Babylonish captivity; when the pressing emergencies of the church required its establishment. The Levites were so far the ministers of religion as that they performed holy ceremonies, copied the law, and in doubtful cases explained it. To them the original of the law was committed (Deut. xxxi. 9.); they were to be its guardians, and to take care to make correct transcripts of it.—The king had to take his copy of the law from their's, (Deut. xvii. 18.) They were bound, at the end of every seven years, to read over the law in the hearing of all the people, (Deut. xxxi. 10—13.); and even to be so conversant in it that they could, at least when questioned, give instructions concerning religion."

Mosaic Law, Article lii. *Dr. Alex. Smith's Translation;* vol. i. p. 254—257.

But I conceive that there is no real opposition, in what I have advanced, to the statements of this eminent biblicist. It is not supposed that the Levites, or any part of their body, formed an ecclesiastical council for the decision of controversies purely religious; or that they, or any of them not specially called by God to the prophetic office, assumed infallibility to their declarations. It was a very different thing (as Michaelis very justly argues in his Annotation on Deut. xvii. 10.) that, as a court of law, they formed a tribunal of the last resort, and from whose decisions no appeal lay. Such a supreme court is necessary in every nation, otherwise litigations would never end. The religious law of the Israelites was indeed intermingled with the political: but we are speaking, not of questions of practice, but of those regarding doctrine and elucidation, and are maintaining that the Levites had it in charge to explain religious subjects, not as dictators, but as well-informed and faithful men, each according to the measure of his knowledge and ability. Michaelis admits that the Levites *explained* the law, as well as read it publicly to the people, and were qualified to *give instructions* concerning religion.

A brief and perspicuous description of the different KINDS of the SACRIFICES and OFFERINGS prescribed in the Mosaic Law will be of general use in the reading of the Scriptures, and will cast much light upon the arguments in the preceding Discourses. I therefore select the following, from the (*Biblisches Realwörterbuch, u. s. w.*) *Bible Dictionary of Persons, Things, and Facts; for the use of Students, Candidates for the Ministry, Teachers of Academic Youth, and Clergymen; by George Benedict Winer, D. D. and Prof. Theol. in the University of Leipzig.* 2 vols. 1820, a work rich in information; but, I lament to say, not free from the poisonous tincture of Neologism. The reader will be candid enough to observe,

that I do not pledge myself to the approval of every particular assertion and implication in these extracts, though I regard them as generally true and correct. Dr. Winer is the author of another very useful biblical work, which has been translated into our own language, improved, and published by the excellent and learned Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, North America: "A Grammar of the New Testament Greek Idiom."

"Among the Hebrews, as among all nations of the ancient world, SACRIFICES formed the most essential part of the worship of God.

"The Mosaic institutions concerning Offerings and Sacrifices, are comprised in the following particulars.

I. "The OBJECTS, or things offered, were taken from both the Vegetable and the Animal kingdom. They were therefore distinguished into the *Unbloody* Offerings (מנחות, *ποσφοραὶ*,) and the *bloody* (זבחים, slain sacrifices, *θυσίαι*,) with both of these, one article out of the Mineral kingdom, *Salt*, was used.

"The *Vegetable* substances used for offerings were both of the *solid* and of the *liquid* kind. Of the former description were flour, cakes, parched or roasted corn, and frankincense: these formed the *meat-offering*, or *mincha* strictly so called. Of the latter kind was the *drink-offering* (נסך, *σπονδή*· see Philip. ii. 17.) consisting of wine,—either *natural*, the juice of grapes simply expressed; or *artificial*, fermented and clarified. According to Josephus (*Antiq.* iii. 9. and compare the *Wisdom of Jesus*, l. 15.) it was poured out all round the altar, and not, as the Jews say, into a peculiar channel or pipe connected with the altar. The drink-offerings were usually united with meat-offerings, and both considered as an addition to the thank-offerings made by fire, but not sin-offerings or trespass-offerings. Num. xv. 5—11. xxviii. 7—15. Lev. xiv. 10—21. A very close similarity existed with the *Libations* of the heathen nations of antiquity. *Iliad* i. 462. *Æneid.* vi. 254. The

heathen drink-offerings consisted of wine mingled with blood (*vinum assiratum; Sallust. Catil.* § 32. *Silius Ital.* ii. 360.) mentioned in Ps. xvi. 4. Zech. ix. 7.

"The *Animals* used in sacrifice were oxen, goats, and sheep: in some cases also turtle-doves and young doves of either sex. All were to be *without blemish:* and, except doves, not under eight days, nor over three years old. Ex. xxii. 20. xii. 5. Lev. ix. 3. Compare the *Iliad* vi. 93. vii. 314. x. 292. *Odyss.* xix. 420. No fishes were ever offered. Human sacrifices were strictly forbidden. Lev. xviii. 21. xx. 2—5.

II. "The PLACE, in which alone offerings could be presented, was the front-court of the National Sanctuary; first, the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple. Lev. xvii. 1—9. Deut. xii. 5—7. Probably the design of this provision was to prevent the possibility of idolatrous rites being practised in private, under the mask of the legal ritual. Yet there are not a few instances of sacrifices offered elsewhere, without any reprehension; and even by prophets themselves. Judges ii. 5. 1 Sam. vii. 17. ix. 12. 1 Kings xviii. 19, 32.

III. "The VIEW with which offerings were brought, was either to express *gratitude* to God for favours received, or to make *expiation* for sins committed. To this belongs the distinction between thank-offerings or sacrifices of praise, and sin-offerings or trespass-offerings.

IV. "In the PERFORMANCE of the sacrifice, the person whose property it was, he being himself first legally purified and sanctified (1 Sam. xvi. 5. comp. Ex. xix. 14.) brought the animal-victim to the altar, at the same time turned himself so as to have his face towards the door of the sanctuary (הקריב Lev. ii. 3, 4. iii. 1. xvii. 4.) and laid his hand upon the head of the animal (Lev. i. 4. iii. 2. iv. 33.) the last act to signify, that the punishment due to him should fall upon the victim. Then he slew it (Lev. i. 5.) which, however, the priest also might do, and in later times actually did; (2 Chron. xxix. 24. Ezra vi. 24.) In the act of slaying, the priest received the

blood in brazen bowls (מזרק,) and sprinkled or poured it near the different offerings, yet apart from them. The offerer then took the skin off the victim, and cut it into pieces; (Lev. i. 6. and perhaps 2 Chron. xxix. 34. refers to this part of the ceremony.) The burning of the proper parts of the sacrifice (namely, the omentum, the fat covering the intestines, the fat of the intestines, the kidneys, the lobes of the liver, and in sheep the fat of the tail,) was attended to by the priest. In some sacrifices, before or after the slaying, the *heaving* or lifting up (תרומה) and the *waving* (תנופה) were usual. The latter consisted in a moving to and fro of the victim, on all sides and towards all the quarters of the heavens; and the former consisted in its being lifted up high towards heaven; (*Gemara, Kiddush,* xxxvi. 2. *Succa,* xxxvii. 2.) Both were a manifest symbol of *presentation* to Jehovah, the Lord of heaven and of the whole earth; perhaps similar to the *porricere* of the Romans: *Macrobii Saturnalia,* iii. 2. Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.* 1615,) on Num. viii. 6. maintains that תנופה signifies *the laying of the consecrated thing before the Lord and before the altar;* against which notion see *Bauer's Description of the Ordinances of Divine Worship among the Ancient Hebrews;* vol. i. p. 137. Jahn is of opinion that the *heave-offering* and the *wave-offering* denoted precisely the same thing, and that sometimes the one and sometimes the other rite is expressly mentioned, since both were always united and had the same symbolical reference; (see his *Introd. to the O. T.* vol. iii. p. 373.) But the following passages prevent our coinciding with this opinion. Ex. xxxviii. 24, comp. Num. xxxi. 52. Ex. xxix. 24, 27, 28. comp. Lev. ix. 21. On the whole subject see *I. G. Carpzovii Appar. Hist. Crit. Antiq. Sacr.* p. 699. *Outram. de Sacrif. Relandi Antiq. Hebr.* iii. 1. *Bauer,* i. 80. *Jahn* iii. 395. *Kaiser's Bible Theol.* ii. 119. *Michaelis on the Mosaic Law,* iv. 48. *Rosenmülleri Excurs. in Schol. ad Levit.*"

V. The various kinds of sacrifice.

i. "BURNT-OFFERING (עלה, Chald. עלתא, כליל, Chald.

עלה; LXX. ὁλοκάρπωσις, κάρπωμα, ὁλοκαύτωμα, Matt. xii. 33. Philo; ὁλόκαυστον· Gen. xxii. 13. Job. i. 8.) was the most distinguished of all the sacrifices, and consisted in the immolating of a *male animal victim* (comp. *Josephi Antiq. Jud.* iii. 10. and 1 Sam. vi. 14.) which was sometimes a bull of three years old, sometimes a sheep or goat of one year old, more rarely a young dove or turtle-dove. It was always consumed entirely in the fire. ("Holocaustum est, quod totum offertur Deo, et sacro igne consumitur." *Hieron. ad Ezech.* xlv.) The sacrifice was slain on the north side of the altar, deprived of the skin (—the skin belonged to the priests, Lev. vii. 8. "The law ordains that the priests, who minister in the sacrifices, should take the hides, a perquisite not little, but rich in a high degree." *Philo de Sacerd. Honor.* p. 833, ed. 1640.) —and cut up into the proper pieces, by the offerer himself. The priest received the blood in a bowl, sprinkled it around the altar, and then laid all the parts of the victim separately upon the fire, which it was his duty to keep always burning. Of doves, the priest was to nip off the head with his fingernails, squeeze out the blood on the edge of the altar, pluck off the feathers and throw them with the crop into the ash-pit, divide it down to the wings, and then completely burn it. See Levit. i. 1—17. vi. 1—6.

"The DESIGN of the burnt-offerings was to make atonement with God for sins committed, in general, (Lev. i. 4.): and they were presented, partly, in the name of the whole nation, daily, every morning and evening (Ex. xxix. 38—42. Num. vii. 15—17, &c. viii. 12. xxviii.) as also in connexion with a sin-offering on the great day of atonement, (Lev. xvi. 3.) and on the three principal anniversary festivals;—partly, in the solemnities of consecration to office, (Lev. viii. 18—29. ix. 2—4. Num. viii. 8.);—and partly, by private persons, in order to be freed from the condition of Levitical uncleanness; namely, by women after child-bearing at the end of the legally prescribed period for the purification, (Lev. xii. 6—8.)—by

lepers when cured, (Lev. xiv. 21, 31.)—by Nazarites, when they had touched a dead body, (Num. vi. 11—14.)—and by those referred to in Lev. xv. 1—15. Persons who brought only two doves for a sin-offering, were obliged to make one of them a burnt-offering; Lev. v. 10. In later times, even heathens sometimes presented this kind of offering: in particular, the Emperor Augustus directed to be offered for himself a daily sacrifice of two lambs and a bull. (*Philo, in Leg. ad Caium; Joseph. Bell. Jud.* ii. 17.) Hecatombs of burnt-offerings are mentioned in Ezra vi. 17. 1 Chron. xxix. 21. 2 Chron. xxix. 32. comp. *Odyssey*, iii. 6—9. *Ovid. Trist.* ii. 1, 75."

ii. TRESPASS-OFFERING and SIN-OFFERING *(sacrificia piacularia)*, among the Hebrews, were sacrifices offered for such trangressions as were not punished by the laws of the state, or which were known only to the conscience of the individual. The trespass-offering was called *asham* (אשם) and the sin-offering *hattath* (חטאת); and they are actually distinguished, both in the prescriptions of the law itself (Lev. vii. 1—10, of trespass-offerings, and iv. 6, 25—30, of sin-offerings,) which enumerate, with minute care, the circumstances under which each of the two was to be brought; and in other passages; e g. Num. vi. 12, comp. 14. Lev. xiv. 12, comp. 19, &c.

" *Trespass-offerings* were brought in the following cases:

1. " When a person did not inform of a crime committed by another, he having been privy to it, and being legally required to give information.

2. " When a person had touched any unclean object, and discovered it too late, so that he had not brought the sacrifice of purification.

3. " When a person had rashly sworn that he would do a particular thing, and then through forgetfulness neglected to do it, but thought of it afterwards when too late.

4. " When a person had, through mistake, applied to a

common purpose any thing which had been consecrated to a holy use.

5. "When a person had refused to give up what had been committed to his trust, or violated an engagement, or denied stolen property which had come into his hands, or concealed and forswore any lost thing which he had found.

6. "When any person had, through ignorance, done something forbidden, and became afterwards apprised of it.

7. "When a man had criminal connexion with a betrothed female slave, who was not redeemed, nor had in any other way obtained her freedom. Lev. xix. 20—22. To this may be added the contracting of idolatrous marriages: see Ezra x. 19.

"Besides these, a Nazarite who had contracted defilement by touching a dead body (Num. vi. 9—12.) and a leper who had been cured, (Levit. xiv. 12, 24.) were to bring a trespass-offering.

"The object sacrificed in this kind of offering was different on different occasions. In cases 1, 2, and 3, it was a ewe or a she-goat; or, if the sacrificer were poor, it might consist of doves or fine flour without oil and incense. In cases 4 and 5, it was a ram without blemish; besides which the guilty person was to restore the alienated property and add to it one fifth of the value; in case 4, to the priest, in case 5, to the owner or his heirs, or if he had died without heirs, to the priest. In cases 6 and 7, the victim was a ram. The Nazarite and healed leper offered a lamb. The victim was always slain on the north side of the altar, the blood sprinkled round it, and the pieces of fat burned upon it.

"*Sin-offerings* were of two kinds, the *greater* and the *less*.

(i.) "The *greater*, which were offered in the following cases.

"1. When the high-priest had committed an offence, and thereby had brought guilt upon the whole nation.

" 2. When the whole nation had committed an offence, through ignorance, and afterwards repented.

" 3. On the great day of atonement, for the high-priest and the nation.

" In the first of these cases, the victim consisted of a young bull, on whose head the high-priest laid his hand and acknowledged his sin. Then he slew the animal on the north side of the altar, spurted the blood with his finger in the holy place of the temple seven times towards the veil or curtain which separated it from the most holy place, besprinkled the altar of incense, and poured out what remained upon the ground in the court before the altar of burnt offering. Only the fat and the usual abdominal pieces were burned upon the altar; all the rest was burned without the gates of the city.

" In the second case, the people offered likewise a young bull, the elders laid their hands upon its head, and it was then sacrificed as in the preceding case.

" The third respected *the great Day of* ATONEMENT. This was the only public fast-day ordained in the Mosaic law. It was celebrated annually on the 10th day (i. e. from the evening of the 9th to the evening of the 10th) of the seventh month, Tisri, five days before the feast of Tabernacles. It was observed with solemnity equal to that of the Sabbath. (Lev. xvi. 1—34. xxiii. 26—32. Num. xxix. 7—11.) The high-priest performed the service of the sacrifice, principally by himself. After he had purified himself by bathing the whole body, and had dressed himself in the appropriate white linen garments, he slew a young bull as a sin-offering for himself and his family, went into the most holy place, there kindled with coals from the altar a composition of perfumes, so that the lid of the ark of the covenant (which was regarded as the seat of the present Deity) was entirely covered with the cloud of smoke, sprinkled some of the blood with his finger towards the fore-part of the lid of the ark and seven times upon the ground, and in his returning through the holy

place he smeared some of the blood upon the four corners (" the horns") of the altar of incense. Then he brought forth two goats as the sin-offering for the whole nation; but of these, only one, that upon which the lot " for Jehovah" fell, was actually slain, and with its blood the same ceremonies were repeated that had been performed with that of the young bull. The other, upon which the lot " for Azazel" had fallen, after the high-priest had laid his hands upon it, and had confessed all the sins of the people, was taken, by a person appointed for that purpose, to a desert place, and there set at liberty. Then the high priest bathed himself again, put on his rich official dress, and brought forth two rams and seven yearling lambs (Num. xxix. 9.) as a burnt sacrifice for himself and the nation, and burned upon the altar the usual portions of fat of those sin offerings. All the remains of the victims he directed to be carried out of the camp, or the city, and there to be burned. (See *Marckii Diss. Phil. Theol.* 146. *Dassov. de Ingressu Summi Pontif. in Sanct. Sanctorum. Danz. in Menschen. N. Test. Talm.* 921. *Deyling Obs. Sacr.* 177. *Kirchmeier de Sacerd. Summi Ingr. Overkamp. de eod. arg.*)

" The following remarks are added, for the elucidation of some particulars.

" (1.) The CEREMONIAL of this sacred solemnity is very explicitly detailed by the Talmudical writings; but it is not easy to determine with certainty how much of their descriptions was actually practised. Josephus gives but little information on these points.* In the relation which he gives, it

* " On the tenth day of the same month, reckoning by the moon, they fast till the evening. On this day they sacrifice a bull, two rams, seven lambs, and a kid as a sin offering. To these they add also two kids; of which one is conveyed to the desert beyond the boundaries of the country, to be an *Averting* and *Deprecation* for the whole people, on account of their sins; and the other they take to the cleanest of the places adjoining to the city, and there they burn it with its skin, without using any ceremonies of purification. A bull is likewise burned in the

will be at once perceived that much of the scriptural statement is omitted; for example, the changing of the high priest's dress, and the burning of perfumes, upon which so much stress appears to be laid in the passages above cited from the book of Leviticus: much also is more closely defined; as, in particular, it would appear, from the words 'he takes into the temple some of the blood' &c., that the high priest carried the blood of both the sin offerings at the same time into the most holy place; which is not quite clear from the passages in Leviticus.

"The substance of what the Talmudists say upon this subject is as follows.

"[1.] That, in addition to the peculiar observances of the day of atonement, the high priest had to perform the ordinary service of a sabbath; such as the lighting of the lamps, the presentation of the morning and evening sacrifice, &c. of which nothing occurs in the Bible or in Josephus, but which is certainly not improbable.

"[2.] That he went *four* times into the most holy place: first, with the sacred perfume, during which time a priest was shaking the blood of the bull, that it might not coagulate; the second time, with the blood of the bull; the third, with that of the goat; and the fourth time, to fetch out the censer of incense. Of all this the Bible and Josephus say nothing, and Philo directly contradicts the assertion.*

same manner, provided, not by the people, but by the high priest at his own expense. When it is slain, he takes into the temple some both of its blood and of the kid's, and sprinkles it seven times with his finger on the covering [of the ark], and the same on the pavement: this also he repeats, an equal number of times in the body of the temple and around the golden altar; and he carries the rest into the open air, and sprinkles it round the greater altar. In addition to these, they lay [to be burned] upon the altar the [ἐξοχαὶ] horns and legs, the kidneys, and the fat, with the lobe of the liver. The high priest also presents a ram, as a whole burnt sacrifice to God." *Josephi Antiq. Jud.* III. x. 3.

* "If even the high priest himself should enter into it on more than

" [3.] That, at the third time of his staying in the temple, as soon as he had returned into the holy place, he sprinkled eight times the blood of the bull and afterwards of the goat towards the veil, then poured together the two bloods and therewith smeared the horns of the altar of incense and a part of its surface; and at last poured the rest of the blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering.

" [4.] They add a fable about a purple bandage, a part of which was tied to the goat that was sent away.—(*Mischna, Surenhusii*, II. 206. *Joma*, vi. 8. *Schabba*, ix. 3. *Tertullian. adv. Jud.* iii. 3. *Maimonid. in Crenii Opuscul.* vii. 651, 819. On the seven days' preparation of the high priest for this solemn day, see *Relandi Antiq. Hebr.* iv. 6, 5. *Carpzov. Apparat.* p. 434.)

" (2.) The signification of the word AZAZEL (עזאזל) has been the subject of much controversy, and we can scarcely expect it to be brought to a satisfactory determination. Some understand by this term, the *place* to which the goat was to be driven, a rugged valley which, according to Aben Ezra was not far from Sinai: this is the opinion of Jonathan [the Targumist] and many of the rabbis, and among the moderns, Vatablus; and it corresponds to the Arabic *jil azaz, a rugged mountain*, and the Greek *σκληροβάτης*.—Others maintain that Azazel was the name given to the goat itself; so the LXX. *ἀποπομπαῖος*, Symmachus, *ἀπερχομενος* the Vulgate, *hircus emissarius;* [the authorized English Version, *scape-goat;* and most modern versions adopt the same or a similar rendering: Luther has 'the acquitted goat;' the Geneva Version of 1805, 'the goat destined to be thrown down the precipice:' Calvin and Diodati have *Azazel*, untranslated.] But this meaning is extremely difficult to be rendered probable. See *Gesenius's Hebr. Lex.*—Others take it for an Arabic broken

this one day in the year, or more than a second time on that day, he would meet inevitable death." *Legatio ad Caium*, p. 1035.

plural, *nghrazazel, lonesomeness, solitude, desert,* ארץ גזרה. So *Bochart, Carpzov. Rosenmüller, jun.* in his Scholia, *Hackmann, Jahn,* and *Gesenius,* in his *Lehrgebäude.*—Others have thought that, by this name was understood a *wicked spirit,* to whom this *goat laden with sins* was to be devoted. So, following many of the rabbis, *Spencer, de Legib. Rit. Hebr.* and see *Ammon's Bible Theol. Rosenmüller's Ancient and Modern Oriental Illustr. Gesenius* in his Lexicon. The doctrine concerning dæmons, maintained by the later Jews and the Mahometans, actually applies this name [and others like it] to wicked spirits. But this might be a fiction of the later Judaism: at least, as we find no vestiges of a belief in wicked angels and dæmons before the time of the captivity,* we should hardly build the explanation of this subject upon such very insecure data. Comp. Lev. xvii. 7. and *Bochart* in his *Hierozoicon,* I. 745.—Finally, there are some who understand the word as compounded of עז and אזל, and signifying *the departing goat;* in which the only difficulty is that, in other places עז denotes a kid, not a goat. On this subject, see *Carpzov. Appar., Bochart, Marckii Sylloge,* p. 172. *Le Moyne Varia Sacra,* ii. 649, *Schröder, Frischmuth,* and *Schafshausen,* in their respective Dissertations on this subject; and other authors.

(3.) On the Symbolical Design of this observance. "It is not certain whether the goat which was driven into the wilderness, was considered merely as doing penance or making atonement for the sins of the nation, in their stead; or as carrying away with him the burden of sins, as it were from the presence of Jehovah. The latter idea appears the more probable, especially on account of the analogy with the offering of purification, mentioned in Lev. xiv. 4—7, in which the one bird's being allowed to go free could scarcely be for any other reason, than symbolically to take away with it the

* A position which we do not concede to Dr. Winer.

impurity of the leper. See *Witsius de Fœd.* 543. *Spencer,* 1051. *Bauer; Süskind; De Wette.*

" (4.) No solemnity, similar to this day of atonement, is to be found in any nation of antiquity. The Mohammedan month of fasting, *Ramadan,* has some degree of resemblance to it; and still more the fast-day of the Hindoos, *Sandrajonon (Priestley's Compar. of the Instit. of Moses with those of the Hindoos,* &c.) The *Supplications* of the Romans, which were ordered upon any public calamity, were of a very different description. See *Livy,* iii. 7. xxiv. 10. xxvii. 37.—On the whole subject, see *Reland,* iv. 6. *Carpzov. App.* 433. *Leusdeni Philol. Hebr. Mixt.* 281. *Mœller de Rit. Festi Exp. Hochstetter de Festo Exp. Bauer; Jahn.*

" (ii.) The *lesser kind* of sin offerings. These were brought in the following cases.

" 1. When a magistrate committed an offence through error. The sacrifice was a kid, whose blood was partly smeared upon the altar, partly poured upon the ground; the fat pieces only came to the altar; the rest fell to the priest. Lev. iv. 22—26.

" 2. When a private person sinned through ignorance. The sacrifice was a ewe or a female kid.

" 3. When a woman was purified from a long continued hæmorrhage; or, after child-birth, had reached the time of purification. Lev. xv. 25—30. xii. 6. 8.

" 4. Lev. xv. 2, 14, 15.

" 5. When a Nazarite had touched a corpse, or the time of his vow was completed. Num. vi. 10—14.

" 6. On the consecration of a priest or Levite. Lev. ix. 23. Num. viii. 8, 12.

" 7. On the purification of a leper. Lev. xiv. 19—31.

" In the cases 3, 4, 5, and 7, the sacrifice was usually a sheep or a dove: but in the 6th, an ox or a goat. References as above, and Num. vii. Ezra vi. 17. viii. 35. Num. xix.

But all the cases 3 to 7, are exempted from the general rule in Lev. iv. 2, 13. xxii. 27.

"From a comparison of the directions concerning trespass-offerings and sin-offerings, it follows:

"1. That in numerous cases, both the kinds of sacrifice were united.

"2. That in both, an acknowledgment of trespass or sin was required.

"3. That the chief difference between the ceremonies prescribed in each case, consisted in the manner of sprinkling the blood. On the other hand, it is not clear what distinction the lawgiver made between אשם *trespass*, and חטאת *sin;* since there does not appear any foundation for making an essential difference in the kind of the transgressions which were expiated by the one or the other kind of sacrifice. Hypotheses on this subject, widely different or directly contradictory to each other, have been maintained by the numerous writers on Hebrew Archæology; of which only the principal can be here stated, and a brief opinion offered upon them. (See *J. C. Schubert de his Sacrif.*)

"(1.) Some have held the sin-offering to have been presented on occasion of the more heinous offences, and the trespass-offering for those of a less aggravated character; (*Venema. Diss. Sacr.* 822, comp. *Maimonid. More Nev.* iii. 46.) Others invert this opinion; (*Bonfrère on Lev.* iv.) The former sentiment has however more in its favour, though the distinction does not apply to every case of sin-offering; as, of the lesser kind, cases 3, 4, 5, and 7. and in no way is it made clear, *by what standard* the law-giver estimated the comparative greatness or lightness of transgressions.

"(2.) Some refer the trespass-offerings to the violation of a covenant, or tacit contract, with the priests, the fellow-citizens, and the married men; and they suppose that the reason of the presentation lies in the accusing conscience of

the offender; (*Cremer. Antiq. Sacr. Pœc.* ii. 75.) but this cannot be applied to the case of lepers; and, upon the whole, the idea of a covenant is too far-fetched. Also, it is not peculiarly nor merely the priest who sustained damage, by the alienation of any thing that was consecrated to Jehovah: but we may, with equal propriety, apply the same term to the violation of a covenant between Jehovah and mankind; consequently the whole hypothesis is overthrown, for this idea of a covenant with Jehovah may be applied to all the kinds of sin-offering.

"(3.) Others suppose that the trespass-offerings were to be brought by those whose transgression was secret, or incapable of being proved by any human accuser; but the sin-offerings, by those whose crimes might be proved by witnesses. (*Relandi Antiq. Sacr.* iii. 4, 4. *Schulz Archæol.* 269. *Schwarz de Nexu Doctr. Lev. et Chr.* 20. *Bauer*, i. 148.) For the support of this opinion, stress is laid upon a passage in Josephus,* and another in Philo.† But De Wette justly remarks that this difference does not apply to all the cases that have been adduced (e. g. Num. vi. 12, 14. Lev. xiv. 12, 24. Lev. xv. 25—30.), and he adds, 'It may be supposed that the true reason of a distinction, which had at first existed between those kinds of sacrifice, had, in process of time, gone into

* "He who from ignorance falls into this amenableness, offers a lamb and a female kid of the same age.—But he who commits the offence, being himself aware of it, though no other person could convict him, sacrifices a ram; for so the law ordains." *Antiq. Jud.* III. ix. 3.

† "If any person tell a lie about a partnership, or a thing deposited with him, or a thing that has been stolen, or a thing found which another had lost, though he may have thought that he had escaped conviction from accusers, yet he becomes his own accuser, convicted inwardly by his own conscience, and he takes the blame to himself for his falsehood and perjury, confessing to the opposite party the injustice which he has done;—he must restore the property that had been alienated,—adding a fifth of the value;—the law commands him to bring a ram." *De Victimis; Op.* p. 844.

oblivion, and become neglected; while yet the distinction itself was, in an imperfect manner, kept up.'

"(4.) Others have regarded the trespass-offering as a sacrifice for a sin of *omission*, and the sin-offering for one of *commission*. So *Michaelis*, on Lev. v. 1—5. *Suppl. ad Lex.* 718. *Warnekros's Antiq.* 150, 153. *Babor's Antiq.* 436. *Simonis's Jewish Antiq.* iii. 3. *Jahn*, ii. 331. iii. 388. and, on the contrary side, *Bauer*, 148. *Gesenius's Lex.* אשם. An example of trespass-offerings for sins of active transgression occurs in Lev. v. 17—19. (Against the highly arbitrary conjecture of Michaelis, see *Vater on the Pentat.*) The passages, Num. vi. 11. Lev. xiv. 12, 24. Lev. xv. 25, &c. treat not in the least of sins of omission. Lev. v. 17—19, stands against Saubert's hypothesis, that by *transgressions* אשם intentional and deliberate crimes were intended, and by *sins* חטאת the offences arising from ignorance or error. Lev. v. 6, opposes Rosenmüller, who maintains that male lambs were always used.

"As none of these attempts is satisfactory, and as, in the statements of the law itself, nothing is contained that can, in any measure, conduct us safely to a determination upon the distinction between the sin-offering and the trespass-offering, it seems best entirely to renounce making a distinction.

"It remains to be investigated, *what idea*, as to the DESIGN and END, was connected with the putting to death of the victim sacrificed in sin-offerings and trespass-offerings; that is, whether the sacrifice was regarded merely as a *present to the offended Deity;* or, as Michaelis supposed, a *civil penalty* (*Mosaic Law*, IV. 64.); or as a *representative and substitute* of the person who offered it, thus acknowledging himself to be a sinner and to be deserving of death; (see the Rabbinical work *Reschith Chocma*, 3. *Grotius de Satisf.* cap. x. *Stäudlin* in the *Göttliche Bibliothek*, ii. 847. *Süskind* in *Flatt's Magaz.* iii. 196.) The formula 'shall make an atonement for him,' &c. (Lev. v. 18. xiv. 19, and many other places,) does not completely clear up the subject: and the laying on of the

hand is not *decisive* in favour of the last idea, since that ceremony was used in other sacrifices. But the following reasons favour this idea of the death of the victim as a *substitute* for the offerer.

"1. As the sin-offerings were usually attended with blood, and as the Hebrews regarded the blood as the seat of life (Lev. xvii. 1,) the shedding of the blood might be a very proper symbol of the out-streaming life: compare also Lev. vi. 19.

"2. Other sacrifices also were symbols of a substitutionary death: for example, the sacrifice for ratifying a covenant; (Jer. xxxiv. 18—20.) and the sin-offering on account of a murder perpetrated by some unknown person; (Deut. xxi.) This idea stands also in evident connexion with the *Azazel*, or goat for a sin-offering, which, on the great day of atonement, was driven into the wilderness.

"3. חטא signifies *to bear the loss of any thing*, or *to make good the damage sustained*, (Gen. xxxi. 39.); and this word is also used to denote an *expiation;* and so the noun כפר (*kopher*) connected with the verb כפר (*kipper*) denotes a *ransom-price*. [This noun and verb are those used in the description of the Levitical sacrifices.]

"4. The idea of an expiation by sacrificed victims was undeniably prevalent among other nations of antiquity. Of the Egyptians, Herodotus says that, having cut off the head of the sacrificed victim, 'they utter a long string of execrations upon it,—and they throw it into the river:—in uttering their execrations,—their design is that, if any evil be imminent over themselves, the sacrificers, or over their country, it may be turned upon this head. In this manner, with regard to the heads of sacrificed animals, and the libations of wine, all the Egyptians use the same rites in all their temples.' *Euterpe*, 39. And so Cæsar, concerning the Gauls; 'They are all extremely addicted to superstition: therefore it is their practice, when seized with alarming diseases, or going to battle,

or exposed to other dangers, to vow that they will sacrifice human victims, or even themselves; in which sacrifices, the Druids are the priests: for it is their opinion that the majesty of the immortal gods can be propitiated, only by giving the life of man for the life of man.' *B. G.* vi. 16.

iii. Of the kinds of sacrifice, the last to be enumerated is "the THANK-OFFERING (זבח שלמים, εὐχαριστικὸν, χαριστήριον, εἰρηνικόν) consisting in the presentation of a bull, sheep, or goat, without blemish, and of either sex; which was brought by the offerer, with laying on of hands, to the altar, and was slain by him on the south side of it. The priest received the blood and sprinkled it round the altar. The pieces of fat only were burned. The breast and shoulder, the former of which the offerer was to *heave* and the latter to *wave*, belonged to the priest. The rest was applied to the use of a sacrificial feast: compare 1 Cor. x. 18.

"The thank-offerings were brought, sometimes on account of a particular blessing received from Jehovah, called therefore *a sacrifice of praise* (שלם תודה, LXX. θυσία ὁμολογίας, αἰνέσεως,) sometimes from the general feeling of pious inclination, *a free-will offering* (נדבה;) sometimes on the satisfaction of a vow (נדר;) Num. vi. 14. The first were united with meat-offerings consisting of unleavened cakes, and a leavened loaf which went to the priest: the sacrificial feast was obliged to be held on the same day: Lev. vii. 15, 16. while, in the case of any other thank-offering, this feast might be put off to to the second day; (Lev. vii. 16. iii. 7, 11—36. Deut. xii. 12—18.) *Carpzov.* 706. *Bauer*, i. 119. *Jahn*, iii. 395.

"Among thank-offerings, in the most extensive sense, might be reckoned the presentation of the first-born and the first-fruits, the second tythe, and the Lamb of the passover."

On the respective articles which Dr. Winer has thus elucidated, the reader may advantageously consult the recent English edition of *Calmet's Dictionary*, with the *additions* of the late *Mr. Charles Taylor*.

Note VIII. page 23.

THE CROWNED PRIEST AND KING. Zech. vi. 13. To assure ourselves of correctly interpreting this verse, it is necessary to review the whole scene as represented in vision to the prophet; chap. vi. 9—15. The returned Jews were dejected by their difficulties, and had sunk into supineness and coldness. The prophet is directed to receive a contribution of silver and gold, which four principal persons, recently arrived from Babylon, had brought in aid of the restoration of the temple. The idea of a contribution or a consecrated gift is inferred from the connexion and circumstances, and from the exact rendering of the words, "Take from the captives [literally, *the captivity;* but the abstract noun is often put to denote the persons who had been dragged into captivity; as, for instance, Ezra vi. 19. Jer. xxviii. 4. xxix. 1, 4, 20, 31. Ezek. i. 1. iii. 11, 15. xi. 24, 25. Dan. vi. 14.] from Heldai, from Tobijahu, and from Jedaiah:" something must be understood as governed by the verb, and this is supplied after the same verb in the next sentence, "Take silver and gold." With a portion of this silver and gold, he is instructed to make, or procure to be made "crowns:" how many, is not mentioned; but *two* is the most probable and generally supposed number, because, had more been signified, it is contrary to usage to omit the numeral; because one crown seems to be intended to be made of each of the two metals; and because the reference of this coronation is to the two offices of royalty and priesthood.*

* "The *crown* was a symbol of a person preeminently venerable and sacred: among the ancient Hebrews, it was worn not only by kings, but also by priests, (Ex. xxviii. 36, 37. xxix. 6. 2 Sam. i. 10.) the form of each being somewhat different. The double crown placed upon the head of a single person, Joshua, represented the two fold dignity, the royal and the priestly, to be united in some one person, that is the priesthood of the Messiah (whom Joshua here represented) according to the

These crowns he is to place, with the solemnity of a prophetic act commanded by God, upon the head of Joshua; uttering a divine declaration. After this ceremony, he is directed to commit the crowns to the four persons, who had been witnesses of the act, that they might deposit them in the temple, to be a constant memorial of this significant and encouraging transaction. There is great difficulty in the interpretation of the last clause of v. 13. whether, by שניהם *the two* or *them both*, we are to understand Jehovah and the person predicted and named a branch, as is maintained by De Dieu and Vitringa; or Zerubbabel and Joshua; or the two offices of dignity represented by the two crowns, and as Michaelis thinks, by two thrones also; or the two great parties of Jews and Gentiles who, by the gospel of Christ, were to be brought into one united body. Each of these opinions has been maintained by persons of learning and judgment. The second seems unwarranted, because Zerubbabel has no share in this part of the prophecy. The third is adopted by the larger number of eminent critics, among whom we find Calvin, Drusius, Henry, Prebendary Lowth, Michaelis, Dathe, and the younger Rosenmüller; but I must confess that it appears to me somewhat forced, and that the supplying by inference an antecedent to the relative increases the difficulty. The fourth is the introduction of a new idea, expressed by a pronoun of reference, but which has not the antecedent assumed, nor any grounds for supplying it to the reader's mind. But I conceive that no solid objection lies against the first interpretation: the personal and masculine form readily attaches to the two persons mentioned immediately before, and which must be the principal objects in the mind of the reader, Jehovah, and the

order of Melchizedec, by which the Messiah was to be both King and Priest of the Most High God.—Joshua, both in name and in the prophetic signification of his office, prefigured the Messiah." *Rosenmüller junior, in loc.*

person whose name and actions the prophecy describes: and the connexion of sentiment is natural, plain, and of the highest importance, namely, that there is the most perfect union of the Lawgiver and the Saviour in the "counsel of peace," the plan of wisdom, rectitude, and love for conferring eternal blessings upon mankind. I have thought it right to state these reasons, in a great measure because I am led by them to differ in some points from a learned and valuable author, who has recently opened his great resources of biblical knowledge, in the illustration of the deeply interesting but difficult portion of prophecy comprised in the first six chapters of Zechariah. See *A Commentary on the Vision of Zechariah the Prophet; with a Corrected Translation and Critical Notes: by the Rev. John Stonard, D. D. Rector of Aldingham.* Upon these positions, I submit a translation of the whole passage.

"Further, a message of Jehovah was [given] to me, saying, Take from [the people of] the captivity, from Heldai, from Tobijahu, and from Jedaiah; and go thou this day; go to the house of Josiah the son of Zephaniah, who are come from Babylon; even take silver and gold, and make crowns, and put upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedek, the high priest; and speak to him saying, Thus speaketh Jehovah [the God] of hosts, saying, Behold, a man: his name Zemach:*

* I have thought it advisable to follow Luther, Le Cène, Michaelis, and Dathe, in not translating this word; partly because the naked term *sprout*, *bud*, or *branch* gives an image which, though readily admitted in the oriental style, does not comport well with our mode of expression; and partly because I doubt whether the rendering of the Septuagint and the Vulgate does not better express the prophet's meaning, in which case we should use the term *rising-star*, *day-spring*, or some equivalent expression. The word Zemach denotes that which shoots forth and increases, and is applied both to the budding and growing of vegetation, and to the rising and shining of a heavenly body: see chap. iii. 8. Is. iv. 2. Jer. xxiii. 5. in which places the LXX. render it by ἀνατολὴ, and compare Luke i. 78. The Chaldee paraphrast gives the clause, "Behold the man,

and from his ground shall he spring forth and build the temple of Jehovah. Even he himself shall build the temple of Jehovah: even he himself shall bear the honour. And he shall sit and rule upon his throne; even he shall be Priest upon his throne; and the peaceful determination shall be between these two. And the crowns shall be [committed] to Helem and to Tobiah, and to Jedaiah and to Hen* the son of Zephaniah, for a memorial in the temple of Jehovah. And men from afar shall come and build in the temple of Jehovah, and they shall know that Jehovah [the God] of hosts hath sent me unto you. This shall be, if ye diligently listen to the voice of Jehovah your God."

Probably in allusion to the annual Levitical expiation, and therefore with an anticipative reference to the real and effectual sacrifice of Jesus, the words are added to the first mention of the Branch and the Stone of salvation (ch. iii. 9.) "and I will take away the iniquity of that land in one day."

Note IX. page 28.

Isaiah liii. Few divines or critics bearing the name of Christian have been hardy enough to deny the application of this most distinguished prophecy to the sufferings and death of Christ, till some recent German writers, of the class which has obtained the unmerited denomination of *Rationalists*, have shewn that scarcely any impiety is too bold for their taste in speculation or their readiness in avowal. The denial of all real prophecy

Messiah is his name;" and it is "justly so rendered," adds Rosenmüller, for we have seen in chap. iii. 8. that the Messiah is intended by the name Zemach, "*the Branch.*"

* The difference of the names in the two recitals of them, has been accounted for in various ways. In ancient proper names, both sacred and profane, variations often occur, arising from causes which we can only conjecture.

or any other kind of immediate revelation, and the assertion that Jesus and his apostles had no sound and just principles in the allegation and application of Old Testament passages, are parts of their system: the rest, therefore, can occasion no surprise. But such adversaries are not to be answered by silence; and contempt is no part of the Christian's armoury. Our duty is to hear them with patience and candour, and to answer them as truth shall require.

The celebrated Dr. William Gesenius, Divinity Professor in the University of Halle, and whose reputation as the great Hebrew scholar of the age, has eclipsed that of Eichhorn, has stated the arguments of the *Anti-Messianists;* and it may well be supposed that he has not failed to represent them in all the strength that they are capable of, as, unhappily, he is a partizan of their opinion. I shall copy them from his *Philologisch-Kritiker und Historischer Commentar über den Jesaia;* vol. iii. p. 162—164. Leipzig, 1821. He, with De Wette and others of their kind, maintains that the object of the pathetic passage before us is to depict, under the figure of an imaginary person, the neglect and ill-treatment which the faithful and patriotic prophets met with from their ungrateful countrymen.

"— As a prophecy of the sufferings, death, and exaltation of Christ; this passage cannot be admitted; for the following reasons.

Obj. "i. The application to the Messiah which the New Testament makes of the place, is no proof of this being its original historical sense; because the established principle of interpretation in the period of the New Testament, was to expound and apply the Old Testament in a prophetic sense, without the least regard to the proper and genuine meaning of a passage. Moreover, this passage is not made use of in application to the doctrine of an *expiatory death,* and Matt. viii. 7. is quite contrary to such an application."

Reply. 1. That accommodations of Old Testament sentences

are, in the New Testament, occasionally made to occurrences and occasions, as they arose, and to which there had been no reference in the original passage, we readily admit. But this admission does not involve any denial or doubt of the solid grounds on which Jesus and his inspired followers *declared* passages of the Old Testament to have been *uttered by the Holy Spirit expressly with a reference* to the subjects to which they are attached. It is as clear as the noon-day sun, that, if this be not admitted, the claims of our Lord and Saviour to be a messenger from God, or even to be an honest man, are exploded; and there is an end of Christianity as a divine institution. Truly, it is a very melancholy exhibition of moral character that, with this consequence fully before their eyes, men should be found who pertinaciously maintain the antecedent, and yet persist in *calling themselves* Christians, and usurping the offices of Clergymen and Theological Professors!* The position itself we oppose in three ways.

(1.) By appealing to the great general evidence of the supernatural origin of Christianity, and the divine inspiration of the apostles.

(2.) By a train of argument upon the nature and design of the dispensations of God under the Old Testament; tracing a unity of plan from the beginning; observing the progress of this plan of gracious restoration; marking the comprehensive and admirable system of preparative instructions, institutions, and events; and evincing that Christianity is no other than the completion of the whole, the accomplishment of that one and sole method of reconciling a lost world to God, which his infinite mercy had put into operation as soon as sin deformed and ruined our nature. An enlarged view of this grand plan of God, constantly illuminated by the increasing discoveries

* See an article in the *Eclectic Review*, for July, 1827, on "The Neologists of Germany;" and another in that for November, on "Dr. Bretschneider's Vindication of the Modern Theology of Germany."

of revelation, discloses innumerable points of *reference* and *contact*, between the dispensation of the patriarchs and prophets, and that of the Blessed Jesus; *to the effect* that *the closest connexion* is shewn to subsist between the Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian; and those individual instances of correspondence, which a pur-blind, narrow-minded, self-inflated rationalist dares to call inconsistent with *hermeneutic* and *exegetical* rules, are evinced to stand upon the strongest ground of reason and evidence.

(3.) By a sincere examination of the single passages, in which the New Testament writers affirm a fulfilment of the Old Testament, with all the lights that we can obtain from philology and history, and "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." In this way, the result of each process of investigation, to a mind imbued with a true spirit of piety, will be found most satisfactory. Others, alas! whose proud hearts will not "receive the love of the truth that they may be saved," embrace "strong delusions," and believe their own falsehood. In them is verified the divine proverb, "A scorner seeketh wisdom, and findeth it not." Prov. xiv. 6. On which saying Michaelis remarks: "The scorner finds fault with every thing which the ordinary and sound understanding of men esteems as wisdom. He seeks wisdom with Diogenes's dark lantern; he confuses every thing, and fancies that he sees folly every where. He makes difficulties and objections in things which all men believe, especially where religion and morals are concerned. It is quite the reverse with the man of good understanding. Even the very doctrines in which the scorner finds so many difficulties, are to him easy and evident. —A striking observation in relation to the difficulties which the scorner studies to collect against religion and morality." *Anmerkungen.*

2. With respect to the instance so confidently alleged; if these interpreters had the comprehension of mind to which they make pretension, it might easily occur to them, that the

mercy of Christ in healing men's diseases was an *indication* and *promise* of his powerful grace in the removal of all moral disorders, in saving from the guilt and power of sin. If the objection had any weight, it would go to the length of proving that Jesus was only a country-physician in Judæa, and not a Divine Saviour for all mankind. Even the Polish Socinian Wolzogenius has dispersed the difficulty, if there was any: "The prophet applied these words to the pains and infirmities which Christ had to feel and sustain, in his own body and soul, on our account. That Matthew applies them to the bodily diseases of the people, was because the maladies of the body are often a sign of those which are spiritual, that is of sins. So that this passage of the prophet was twice fulfilled; once, when Christ delivered men from diseases, and that with extreme fatigue and distress on his own part, labouring from morning till evening in healing the sick; so that, in a sense, he took their sicknesses upon himself: again, when, by his sufferings and death, he took away our spiritual diseases, our sins, when 'he himself bore our sins, in his own body, upon the cross.' 1 Pet. ii. 24." Cited in *Witsii Meletemata Leidensia*, p. 403.

Obj. "ii. Great as is the resemblance between the pious sufferer in the prophet, and the circumstances of Christ, still there are several circumstances which do not apply to him. Kings were personally to honour him; lii. 15. comp. xlix. 7. —liii. 8. 'The stroke is upon him,' ought to be in the plural, *upon them*, for למו is never singular.—He was to have 'his grave among the wicked;' v. 9. but Jesus had his from Joseph of Arimathæa.—He was to share the spoil with the mighty, v. 11. which belongs to *worldly* triumphs."

Reply. 1. Is there the shadow of a difficulty in understanding the reverence of kings and the sharing of the spoil, as a most easy and obvious metaphor, denoting the spread of the gospel, and the religious obedience paid to the Saviour and Lord of the world? Has not the imagery been abun-

dantly and gloriously answered by facts? And is it not proceeding to greater triumphs still? The circumstance of his burial, so far from containing a difficulty, is an admirable coincidence of the prediction with the event: for, though "a grave had been assigned to him with the wicked," in the intentions of his enemies, who undoubtedly would have buried his body ignominiously, as they did those of malefactors in general, yet the peculiar providence so ordered it that the rich man's honourable tomb received his body.

2. The pronoun in v. 8. is certainly a grammatical difficulty, if taken to refer to the chief person spoken of. But (not to rest upon the reading of the LXX. εἰς θάνατον, shewing that they read למות *to death;* and approved by Capell, Houbigant, Lowth, Kennicott, and Koppe;) the sense yielded by the proper plural rendering is perfectly consistent with the connexion, the design, and the reference to the suffering Messiah. The reader may have observed it in the Discourse to which this Note is appended. It adds, indeed, one more circumstance of marked recognition to the evidences of that designed reference; and thus shews the passage to coincide with many other Old Testament predictions, in which the final stroke of divine judgment upon the Jewish nation for their rejection of Jesus, forms a distinguished feature.

Obj. "iii. It is perfectly clear that the 'servant of God' in this place is the same person that is the subject of discourse in the parallel passages, ch. xlii. 1—7. xlix. 1—9. l. 4—10. li. 1—3. All these passages are commonly thus understood. But in them there is much more matter still, which cannot be applied to Christ: for example, that he should proclaim the opening of the prison, and the return from the captivity, (xlii. 7. xlix. 5, 9. lxi. 1—3.)—that kings should personally honour him, (xlix. 7.)—also, in xlix. 1—5. l. 4—9. lxi. 1—3. he speaks in the *first* person."

Reply. Thus, then, Professor Gesenius takes advantage of his own and his party's perversions and misinterpretations of

other parts of this sacred book, to fortify himself in the abuse of this! To answer him thoroughly would require an analysis and investigation of the last twenty-six chapters of the Book. But the serious and truly Christian reader, who is acquainted with Lowth and our best English Commentators on this Prophet, is abundantly competent to do this for himself. In particular, he will observe the system of transition and parallelism, by which the temporal mercy shewn to the Jews in their return from the captivity, is made the vehicle of illustrating the infinite and eternal mercies of redemption and salvation to the world. Were a party to come into an English court of law, with pleadings like those of the Professor's, he would be driven out of court with ignominy, upon the honest principle, that "no man can take advantage of his own wrong."

Not unconnected with this, is the hypothesis, first advanced by Koppe, and generally maintained by the Neologists; that the whole latter part of this book, ch. xl.—lxvi. was written, by some unknown Jewish poet, upon the conquests of Cyrus, and his liberating edict to the captive Jews; an hypothesis, all the parts of which may be fairly met singly, *if we hold to the great Christian principle of* REAL *prophecy;* but of which it may be sufficient now to say, that it deliberately and coldly makes this unknown writer, in his most awful descriptions of the prescience and almighty majesty of Jehovah, to have been carrying on an imposture,—an imposture beyond description audacious! For it is the very spirit of those portions, that the events described were yet future and remote, that they were now foretold, and that the fact of their prediction was *the demonstration* of the sole Deity of Jehovah.

Obj. "iv. The expression, *Servant of God*, never occurs as a denomination of the Messiah: also the idea of a Suffering and Expiating Messiah is utterly unknown to the Old Testament, and is indeed in direct contradiction to its predominating representations; even admitting, what is very doubtful, that this idea was taken up by some about the time of Christ."

Reply. Both parts of this assertion are a taking for granted the point in debate: and the latter is a most daring contradiction to HIM who said, *in express reference* to the writings of Moses and the prophets, "Thus it is written, and thus it was necessary that the Christ should suffer. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" "And, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." The men who can so insult the Lord of all, have no difficulty in trampling upon the words of his apostle; "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come; that THE CHRIST SHOULD SUFFER." Acts xxvi. 23.

Obj. "v. The application to the Messiah makes the whole description to be future; but this the form of the discourse does not allow. The suffering, depression, and death of the 'servant of God' are here depicted throughout as being *past*, as in liii. 1—10. (compare also lii. 14.) all proceeds in preterites: but the exaltation of the same person is displayed as *yet to come*, (lii. 13, 15. liii. 11, 12.) and is expressed in future tenses. Thus the author stands between the suffering and the exaltation, and proclaims that the person who *so far* had suffered, shall *now* be glorified. The latter state of things only is that which is described as approaching."

Reply. The prophetic spirit selected the point of time which the nature of the case demanded, as most suitable to the religious intention of the whole manifestation: and this point of time is the solemn and awful pause, THE CRISIS OF HEAVEN, EARTH, AND HELL, when Jesus was lying in the arms of death! Those must be as void of taste as of a Christian mind, who do not feel the exquisite propriety of the time as adapted to the scenery.

Obj. "vi. This interpretation detaches the portion from its necessary connexion with the whole book, (chap. xl.—lxvi.) in which the subject of the discourse is the close-impending

restoration of the Jewish state after its exile, and the joyful compensation for their sufferings, which Israel was yet to experience. To a contemporary reader of this oracle, it would have been absolutely impossible, in this connexion, to transport his thoughts to a Deliverer expected in a far-distant futurity: and little could it signify to him, in his then existing circumstances, to know what would happen five hundred years after."

Reply. Thus do these profane mockers "blaspheme the things which they refuse to know (ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες), and speak great swelling words of vanity." 2 Pet. ii. 12, 18. To this objection the answer to the iiid. is applicable; and I add that it was a necessary part of the scheme of scripture-prophecy that the contemporaries of the prophets, and even the prophets themselves, could very imperfectly understand the meaning of their own predictions. "The Spirit of Christ which was in them, testified before of the SUFFERINGS of Christ, and the GLORIES which should follow; to whom it was revealed that, *not unto themselves, but unto us* they ministered those things." 1 Pet. i. 11. On this interesting subject, the inquiring Christian will receive much benefit from the perusal of *Bishop Horsley's Four Sermons* on 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

Obj. "vii. To conceive of this passage as a *definitive prediction* of a distant occurrence is contrary to the analogy of all the Bible-prophecies, which relate only to a futurity lying close at hand, in the way of general anticipations. The Book of Daniel indeed makes an acknowledged exception, whose xith chapter gives, in the style of prediction, a very detailed history: but with regard also to that, it has been proved, beyond all contradiction, that the Book was published after the event; and the chief circumstance did really not coincide, namely, that the kingdom of God should be set up immediately after the Syrian persecutions."

Reply. Here again the enemy shews himself in his true

colours, those of a real infidelity. All the prophecies in the Bible, according to the Neologists, were nothing more than the anticipations of immediately occurring events; that is, the lucky conjectures of poets, politicians, and sagacious men, who might often have the secret direction of the affairs which they pretended to predict. Gesenius might have spared himself the trouble of detailing his foregoing objections: the single stroke of denying all prophecy would have been surely sufficient.—The proper answer to the objection, I hardly need to say, must be derived from the general study of the Evidences of Revelation, and particularly the Argument from Prophecy. This author is not to be dealt with as a sincere, though erroneous, fellow-Christian; but as one who needs to have his whole mind and heart brought out of the darkness of infidel guilt, to the grace and truth which come only by Jesus Christ.

As a contrast to this repulsive exhibition of perverted talents and abused learning, I introduce with refreshing delight a few words from another German divine, one who, in his numerous writings, (benevolently adapted to all classes from children and youth to mature Christians in general, to students in the universities, to philosophers, and to scholars of the first order,) has aimed at the diffusion of religious truth as the basis of all that is holy and excellent in life; Dr. George Frederic Seiler, Professor of Divinity in the University of Erlangen, who died in 1807.

"On a just acquaintance with the Scripture *scheme of prophecy* depends the true interpretation of all those places of the Old Testament in which occur particular predictions from God. A scripture-critic who allows of no real prophecies as having been fulfilled in Christ, and as still being fulfilled in his kingdom, sees nothing in all the passages which describe futurity, but the earthly expectations of a people greedy after power and riches; he puts meanings upon the words of the prophets, with which they have not the smallest connexion;

he has no perception of the true nature of that moral and political kingdom of God, which the Father hath committed to Christ, the invisible King and Ruler of mankind; he distinguishes not the *divine meaning* of the prophetic declarations from human notions of its subject; he applies to the text of the prophecies, subjects of which they do not treat, and thus he is led to the adoption of explications absolutely false. *What fabrications have not been resorted to, to misinterpret the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah?* How many falsehoods have been written, to make it appear that the Old Testament contains nothing about Jesus Christ?"—"To him who rejects the true doctrine concerning the prophecies and their fulfilment, every thing seems askance and crooked when he casts his careless eye over the passages in the prophets which contain divine predictions; and he transforms the prophets themselves into visionaries." (*Die Weissagung und ihre Erfüllung, u. s. w.* p. 366, 367. Erlangen, 1813.)

Dr. Gesenius proceeds with the following paragraph, which I cite chiefly for the purpose of shewing a specimen of the modes in which the men of his school seek to impose themselves upon the careless and superficial, as worthy to fill pulpits and University chairs, deceiving (it is deeply to be feared) their own souls, keeping the word of reverence for Christianity to the ear, and breaking it to the heart. It may serve also, as an unexceptionable document, to prove what the Neologists mean when, for any purpose, they may talk plausibly about *Prophecies of the Messiah;*—hopes, expectations, wishes and conjectures; the noble aspirings of some great minds after a purer religion, a worship of the Supreme Being, without ceremonies, in spirit and in truth, and the extension of this religion among all nations. (*Gesenius Einleitung, s.* 2.)

"Yet with all persons this passage may and ought to be denominated *a passage relating to the Messiah;* yet in a somewhat different sense from what is usually understood. It falls undoubtedly within the compass of *Expectations of a Messiah;*

[Messianischer Hoffnungen] and it applies directly to the formation of their noblest part, that the religion of Jehovah, with his true worshippers, should at last enjoy a brilliant triumph over the heathen, that the knowledge of God should be spread among all nations by means of the Israelites and their divinely inspired seers, although nothing is said here concerning the person of the Messiah, as in many of the oracles concerning the golden age. This portion of the Expectations of a Messiah is also precisely that which has been brought into accomplishment by the Christian religion; and, in this respect, we make no hesitation to acknowledge that this passage contains a *fulfilled Prophecy of the Messiah.*"

Addition to the Note in page 28.

When our Blessed Lord, in the commencement of his last sufferings, applied to his case a sentence of this prophecy, he added a general declaration which appears designed to embrace the remaining particulars of it. "I say unto you that "this which is written must be accomplished in me, *And he* "*was numbered with the transgressors:* for also the things [or "sayings, τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ.] concerning me have an accomplish-"ment." Luke xxii. 37. That, under this latter clause, Jesus had reference to the other contents of the passage, is freely admitted by De Wette, late Theological Professor in the University of Berlin, and now at Basle; who was one of the most daring Anti-supernaturalists, but it is now said that he has avowed a salutary change of sentiment. Would to God that it may be so; and that he may prove the sincerity of his penitence and conversion by labouring to remedy the moral mischief which he has perpetrated! "Quæ in illo loco

adduntur, καὶ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει, docent respici ad *plura alia* de Jesu præsignificata, quæ *haud dubie in illo ipso oraculo* quærenda sunt." *(De Morte Expiatoriâ Jesu Christi;* p. 94. Berlin, 1813.) In this disquisition, he readily admits that Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews held the doctrine of an expiatory sacrifice by the death of Christ; but he, without hesitation or any appearance of modest difficulty, imputes their doing so partly to prejudice and superstition, partly to the apostles in general having misunderstood their great Master, and partly to a wise and benevolent dexterity; for, says he, "this doctrine proved of the greatest benefit to the interests of Christianity, as it served successfully to attack and overthrow the Jewish superstition, to which many Christians still adhered, by shewing that all other sacrifices were rendered useless and abolished by the sole and supreme sacrifice of Christ." p. 103. He represents Jesus as the purest, wisest, and best of moral teachers; forming and altering his plan according to circumstances; occasionally mistaken and failing in his calculations; but, with wonderful sagacity and presence of mind, making even those cross-accidents to turn to good, in some other way; and, when he perceived that, from the position in which he stood, having mortally provoked the Jewish hierarchy, his falling a sacrifice to their vengeance was inevitable, he, with admirable heroism, making a virtue of necessity, boldly predicted his own violent death, and impressed the minds of his disciples with such sentiments as would ultimately convert his very disaster into the advantage of his cause. With respect to the doctrine of the Atonement itself, the subject of his book, he says, "If we consider the influence which this doctrine has upon the human mind, it is, in the highest degree injurious to religion, by producing that quiet to the soul, conscious of its sins, which it ought to seek *(suis propriis viribus)* only by its own powers. Yet I would not be understood to say that the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ cannot be combined with sincere religion: I only affirm

that the opinion of his death being an expiation for sin, is favourable to the indolence of men. The divine excellency of the Christian religion is especially conspicuous in this, that it directs men to seek their salvation within their own breasts, without any foreign aid whatsoever." p. 102. This plain avowal is, indeed, nothing more than the old Pelagianism, and is the general doctrine of our modern Unitarians: but if this naked statement should lead any to institute a serious comparison of it with the Holy Scriptures, the result can hardly fail to be useful. Who does not perceive that, by this theory, *prayer for spiritual blessings*, with which the Scriptures abound, is rendered absurd and even impious? And are the public in Germany capable of believing such men as De Wette, who, with the history of their own immortal Luther and his constellation of attendant stars before their eyes, can say that the doctrines of redemption favour human indolence?

Note X. page 31.

I have taken pains to render the translation adduced in the Discourse, as exact a picture as I am able to draw of the sacred original. But I assure my serious readers that, in all their scripture-researches, they will obtain eminent elucidation and satisfaction, by the *comparison* of translations, whether the ancient versions, or those made at the period of the Reformation, or those which have been produced by the learning and piety of more recent biblical scholars. Even translations which may, as a whole, be inferior, will often exhibit instances of successful expression, in single words and clauses, most remarkably bringing out the beauty and genuine force of the original. Among the modern versions, I beg leave to point out the extraordinary excellence, particularly in the New Testament, both as to fidelity of sentiment, and felicity of ex-

pression, which distinguishes the French translation of Isaac le Maistre de Sacy, one of the illustrious Society of Port Royal, and a noble sufferer for truth and conscience. He died in 1684.

To assist in this useful work, I here place together a very close representation of four versions which cannot be very generally accessible to English readers, at least till the importance of the German language shall be understood, and its study more generally cultivated among us. And though these are but translations of translations, yet the affinity of our own language affords great facilities for a literal version, and for rendering very perceptible the character of each. The first is by the distinguished scholar, to whom the preceding pages have shewn that I am so much indebted, Sir John David Michaelis, the celebrated Professor at Göttingen, who died in 1791.* The second is by Dr. Seiler, mentioned in the preceding note, concerning whose new translation of the Prophet Isaiah, the younger Rosenmüller makes the following

* It is not without reluctance that I expose to the English reader the strange translation which that great man adopted of the second clause in v. 10; but I cannot honestly suppress it. The difficulty of determining the person, and of course the nominative of תשים seems to have betrayed him, in a fit of eccentricity, to substitute אם *a mother*, for אם *if*: and his interpretation was, that the church and nation of the Jews, personified as is usual with the prophets in the character of a female, rejected Jesus, and with unnatural cruelty gave him up to death. But surely any one of the three constructions is far preferable; (1.) as the second person, "Thou, *i. e.* Jehovah (whose good pleasure was declared thus to smite him) wilt make his soul [life, or *blood*, as נפש evidently signifies in Gen. ix. 5. Levit. xvii. 11. and which Michaelis judiciously applies to v. 12. in his *Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.* No. 1622, § 13.] a trespass-offering:" or (2.) making נפשו the nominative, and understanding it again as the object of the verb, "He himself shall make his own self," &c. or (3.) taking the verb in the reflexive sense, "his soul shall yield itself;" which Gesenius prefers, and supports it by referring to 1 Sam. xv. 2. 1 Kings xx. 12. Ps. iii. 7.

observation: "The eminent Dr. Seiler, whose merits in sacred literature are of the highest order, composed this version of Isaiah for popular use; to which purpose it is admirably adapted. But, on account of the profound knowledge and experience of the author in scriptural interpretation, the learned also will find in this work many valuable elucidations, and such as no other interpreter has touched upon." *Scholia in Jes.* vol. i. præf. p. xxv. The third is by the consummate Hebraician, though deplorable Neologist, Professor Gesenius. The fourth is from Rosenmüller's Latin. With regard to the latter two, how should we lament the power of prejudice and unbelief, which can make those eminent men insensible to the holy beauty of this exquisite passage, and can prevent their beholding in it the grace and glory of our Divine Redeemer!

MICHAELIS.

[13] Behold my servant! splendid and full of glory, high and greatly exalted is he. [14] As many at his presence have turned back astounded, since his appearance is too mean for a man, and his look debased as of one of the common people; [15] so shall he be the delight of the numerous gentiles, and kings shall close their mouths before him: because those to whom nothing had been written, see, and they who had heard nothing mark and observe. [1] But who believes that which he heareth from us? and in whose eyes is the arm of Jehovah displayed? [2] He groweth up before him as a tender shoot, as a root out of dry ground: he hath no fine person, no majestic figure: and should we look upon him who hath so little appearance? and should we entertain delight in him? [3] Contemptible! the most feeble of men! full of sorrows, and recognized only by his wounds! one who hid his face from us, and altogether contemptible! therefore we have not esteemed him.

SEILER.

[13] Behold, my servant does all happily; he is high, venerable, and greatly exalted; [14] so that many shall gaze astonished at him. Though his appearance, compared with others, is very mean, and his figure inferior to that of other men; [15] yet he will atone for many nations. Kings before him shall lay their hands upon their mouths; for now they know what they before did not perceive, they understood what they had never before heard.

[1] But, who believeth our declarations? Who acknowledgeth the mighty arm of Jehovah, when it is revealed? [2] He shoots up among them as a little twig, as the sprout of a root in thirsty ground. Beautiful form and noble aspect he hath not. We looked at him; but there was nothing in him that pleased us.

[3] Disdained is he, scorned among men, the man of sorrows, known by his sufferings, so that men hid their faces before him: he is disdained, and we reckoned him as nothing.

GESENIUS.

13 Behold! my servant shall be prosperous; high and exalted and greatly honoured. 14 As now many are astonished before him (—so disfigured is his aspect before men, and his figure before the children of men.—)

15 So shall many nations exult in him; kings shall close their mouths before him: for what had not been related to them, shall they see; and understand what they had never heard.

1 Who trusts our message? The arm of Jehovah, to whom is it made known?

2 He grew up, like a sprig before him; as a root-shoot out of dry land. Appearance he had none, nor beauty, that we should feel joy in him; no aspect, that we should have pleasure in him.

3 Disdained was he, and deserted by men; sorrow-laden and marked with disease: as one before whom men conceal their countenances, we disdained him and gave him no esteem.

ROSENMUELLER.

13 Behold! my servant shall act prosperously: he shall be illustrious and exalted and very high. 14 As many were astonished at thee, (so deformed was his aspect more than that of any one, and his appearance more than that of any child of man,) 15 so he shall rouse up many nations; before him kings shall shut their mouths: for things untold them they shall see, things unheard they shall understand.

1 Who hath believed what we have understood by hearing? Who perceives what the arm of Jehovah is preparing?

2 He hath grown up as a twig before him, as a shoot out of dry ground. He had no form nor beauty. We looked at him, but there was no fair appearance that we should be desirous of him.

3 The most despised and rejected of men, he was; a man afflicted with sorrows, eminently marked with disease: as an object from which men turn away their faces, he was so despised that we regarded

MICHAELIS.

[4] Truly he bore our wounds, and took upon himself our sorrows. We regarded him as one marked out by the stroke of God, and thrown down: [5] but for our sins is he wounded, and broken for our iniquity; for our benefit the punishment rested upon him, and his bruises are our healing.

[6] We all went astray like sheep, each one his own way; but Jehovah caused the guilt of us all to fall upon him.

[7] He came to it, he submitted to it; and he opened not his mouth: as a lamb to the slaughter-bench he is led, and as a sheep which is silent before her shearers. He opened not his mouth for anguish; and he patiently took the sentence of condemnation. [8] Where was a providence that cared for his life? For he was torn out of the land of the living, and for the sin of my people he went the way to death.

SEILER.

[4] Of a truth, he bore our disease and took on himself the burden of our sorrows. We thought that he was thus by God punished, smitten, and tormented. [5] But he is pierced through on account of our iniquities, he is smitten on account of our sins. He was punished, that we might be saved: he was wounded that we might be healed.

[6] We were all wandering like sheep, and each looked only at his own way: Jehovah laid all our guilt upon him.

[7] Of him it was exacted: and, though he was thus afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth, like a sheep which is led to the slaughter-bench; like a lamb, which in the shearer's hand is dumb and openeth not its mouth.

[8] From anguish, from judgment, he is snatched away. Who can describe his length of life? Out of the land of the living he is torn away: on account of the sin of my people he is smitten.

GESENIUS.

[4] But he was bearing our disease; with our sorrows he charged himself: and we esteemed him punished by God, smitten and distressed by God. [5] He was wounded for our sins, smitten down for our transgressions; for our welfare the punishment fell upon him; by his wounds we are healed.

[6] We all, like sheep, were wide-wandering; each went his own way: but Jehovah threw all our punishment on him.

[7] Ill-treated was he, the only distressed, yet he opened not his mouth; as a lamb which is led to the slaughter-bench, and as a sheep which is dumb before its shearers and openeth not its mouth.

[8] From the oppression and judicial sentence he was taken away: and who, of his contemporaries, reflected that he was taken away out of the land of the living; that for the sin of my people the pu-

ROSENMUELLER.

him as nothing. [4] Truly, he hath born our sicknesses and carried our sorrows: but we reckoned him to be ruin-stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted. [5] But he was wounded for our crimes, bruised on account of our sins: the chastisement which causes our welfare was inflicted upon him, and by his wheals we have got healing.

[6] We all like sheep have wandered; each one has looked to his own way: but Jehovah commanded to fall on him alone, the punishment which we should all have endured. [7] He was cruelly treated and afflicted; but he opened not his mouth, as a sheep which is led away to the slaughter; and as a lamb which is dumb before its shearers, he opened not his mouth.

[8] He was snatched away from oppression and judicial punishment: but who was there among the men of his age, that reflected that he was cut off out of the land of the living? [Who was there that would say

MICHAELIS.

' His grave was assigned to him with malefactors; but with a rich man he was received at the time of his death: because he had done no unrighteousness, and no deceit had been in his mouth. [10] God took pleasure therein, to smite and wound him; a mother will give up his life for a trespass-offering.

He will see a seed and live long, and what Jehovah hath decreed shall by him be brought to effect.

[11] After his severe toil, he will again look up with joy, and be satisfied: and by his doctrine will he, my servant, the faithful one, lead many to truth, and he will bear their sins.

[12] Therefore will I give him a share of booty with the great ones, and he shall have the mighty ones for his spoil; since he hath poured out his life's blood unto death, and was reckoned among malefactors. But he bare the sins of many, and will pray for the transgressors."

SEILER.

' His grave was intended to have been among sinners, but he was laid in the tomb of the rich man; for he had committed no wrong, neither was any deceit found in his mouth.

[10] Jehovah, in fulfilment of his own gracious counsel, caused him to be thus smitten down and to suffer. Since he hath given up himself to be a trespass-offering, he shall be gladdened with his posterity; long, long shall he live; the gracious counsel of Jehovah shall, through him, proceed prosperously. [11] After the labour which he has endured, he has enjoyment and satisfaction. Through his knowledge, my servant, the righteous one, maketh many righteous; for he bore their sin.

[12] Therefore I assign to him many for his booty, and he himself shall as his booty distribute the mighty; because he poured out his life's blood unto death; because he was reckoned among the transgressors; because he hath borne the sins of many, and hath prayed for the transgressors.

GESENIUS.

nishment befel him.

[9] His grave was assigned with the evil-doers, with the godless in his death; though he had done no injustice, and no deceit was in his mouth.

[10] It pleased Jehovah deeply to wound him. But, because he hath given up himself to be a trespass-offering, he beholds his posterity, and lives yet long, and the work of Jehovah prospers by his hand.

[11] His soul, free from sufferings, is satisfied with the prospect. By his wisdom my righteous servant leads many to righteousness, and he lightens the burden of their sins.

[12] Therefore I give him his lot among the mighty; with heroes he shall share the booty: because he gave up his life unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors; because he bare the guilt of many, and prayed for the criminals.

ROSENMUELLER.

within himself,] For the crimes of my people this suffering has been inflicted upon him? [9] When he died, he yielded himself up to the impious and haughty, to be buried; although he had done no violence, nor was deceit in his mouth.

[10] Yet it pleased Jehovah to smite him with a death-wound. But, since he hath interposed himself as an atoning sacrifice, he shall see his posterity, he shall prolong his life, and he shall successfully execute the mandates of Jehovah.

[11] After the sorrows which he hath endured, he shall obtain that which will satisfy him: by his knowledge shall my godly servant bring many to godliness, having made atonement for their crimes.

[12] Therefore I will distribute to him many [nations,] and he shall obtain the mighty for his spoil; because he poured out his life unto death, and was numbered with the wicked, and bare the sins of many, and interceded for the guilty.

Note XI. page 39.

Causation. Here I am of opinion, that we can levy a contribution to revelation and the doctrine of redemption, from the very heart of the enemies' country. Some Christian writers, and especially Dr. Isaac Barrow, have long ago published their conviction, that of power and causality we are, and, in the present state, necessarily must be, completely ignorant; and that all our knowledge of what we call cause and effect is nothing more than the perception of a series of antecedents and consequents. Till of late, however, Hobbes and Hume were the authors who had placed this subject in the clearest light; the latter having probably borrowed from the former. "We have sought in vain," says Mr. Hume, "for an idea of power or necessary connection in all the sources, from which we could suppose it to be derived. It appears that, in single instances of the operation of bodies, we never can, by our utmost scrutiny, discover any thing but one event following another, without being able to comprehend any force or power, by which the cause operates, or any connection betwixt it and its supposed effect. The same difficulty occurs in contemplating the operations of mind on body; where we observe the motion of the latter to follow upon the volition of the former; but are not able to observe or conceive the tie which binds them together, or the energy by which the mind produces this effect. The authority of the will over our own faculties and ideas is not a whit more comprehensible: so that, upon the whole, there appears not, through all nature, any one instance of connection, that is conceivable by us. All events seem entirely loose and separate. One event follows another; but we never can observe any tie betwixt them. They seem conjoined, but not connected."—"Even in the most familiar events, the energy of the cause is as unintelligible as in the most extraordinary and unusual, and we only learn

by experience the frequent CONJUNCTION of objects, without being ever able to comprehend any thing like CONNECTION betwixt them. Here then many philosophers think themselves obliged by reason to have recourse, on all occasions, to the same principle, which the vulgar never appeal to but in cases that appear miraculous and supernatural. They acknowledge mind and intelligence to be, not only the ultimate and original cause of all things, but the immediate and sole cause of every event that appears in nature. They pretend, that those objects which are commonly denominated *causes*, are in reality nothing but *occasions;* and that the true and direct principle of every effect is not any power or force in nature, but a volition of the Supreme Being." *Hume's Philos. Essays. Ess. vii.*

Upon this doctrine, a living and most eminent philosopher has observed: "Mr. Hume had the merit of shewing clearly to philosophers, that our common language, with respect to cause and effect, is merely analogical; and that if there be any links among physical events, they must for ever remain invisible to us. If this part of his system be admitted; and if, at the same time, we admit the authority of that principle of the mind, which leads us to refer every change to an efficient cause; Mr. Hume's doctrine seems to be more favourable to theism, than even the common notions upon this subject: as it keeps the Deity always in view, not only as the first, but as the constantly operating efficient cause in nature, and as the great connecting principle among all the various phenomena which we observe. This, accordingly, was the conclusion which Malebranche deduced from premises very nearly the same with Mr. Hume's."—*Mr. Dugald Stewart's Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind, vol. i. p.* 549. 8*vo. ed.*

In truth, the evidence of this fact lies in every man's own consciousness. He has only to fix his reflection attentively upon it, to perceive that it is certain and unquestionable.—But it is not implied, as perhaps Mr. Hume would have been willing that his readers should infer, that events are fortuitous

and insulated, that no connecting power exists, producing and maintaining a physical and a moral order. The proper inference is, that the phenomena of the universe are a collection of *constituted* series, the result of divine wisdom, the object of divine power, the production of HIM "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:" that the great moral constitutions of LEGISLATIVE RECTITUDE and REDEEMING MERCY, —are parts of the one, all-wise, harmonious, and perfect system of the universe; and that the union of all is the immediate effect of Jehovah's infinite power, acting from the highest reason, namely, holiness, conjoined with benevolence.

Note XII. page 39.

In the former edition this was expressed, "Jesus Christ voluntarily sustained the guilt and punishment of sin." As the term *guilt* is liable to misconstruction, I have declined retaining it; though it was used in a sense quite, I trust, unobjectionable. We commonly employ this term both in the sense of LEGAL ANSWERABLENESS (*reatus*,) and of BLAMEWORTHINESS (*culpa*.) It was only in the former sense, and by no means in the latter, that the word was here introduced. In divinity, as well as in other sciences, it is necessary to attach to some terms a technical definiteness of signification, much more restrained than the ordinary acceptation of the same words. It were to be wished that, in all such cases, we had words appropriated only to the particular objects: but the usage of language (quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi,) forbids such a wish. If scepticism or rashness should raise a cavil, we can only reply, that the cavil is unreasonable. No man ridicules mathematical terms, because, in many instances, they are the words of common life employed in a very restricted signification.

Note XIII. p. 43.

Sufferings of Christ for us. It is a common method of eluding the force of these scriptural passages, to maintain their simple meaning to be that Christ gave himself, suffered, and died for us, that is, *for our benefit;* in other words, we derive from his death important advantages, such as evidence of his sincerity, confirmation of our faith in his mission, and a valuable example of suffering virtue. But, according to this reasoning, our benefit from the death of Christ is only one article of the general sum of blessing derived from him, and to which his exemplary life, his doctrine, his miracles, and above all, his resurrection, contributed as much, or more, than his death. We should, therefore, have expected to find the forgiveness of our sins, and deliverance from condemnation, ascribed equally to any or to all of these. But how different is the fact? Christ lived, and taught, and proved his divine commission, for us; and we have thus a most important benefit from him in those respects: but it is to his *sufferings* and *death alone* that the New Testament attributes the putting away of sin, remission, propitiation, reconciliation, redemption, and peace with God. This very marked difference deserves most serious consideration from those who deny, or doubt, the doctrine of the atonement. Another circumstance places this argument in a still stronger light. To the piety and constancy, the sufferings and martyrdom, of Christ's immediate disciples, we are immensely indebted; as in those facts, combined with their peculiar circumstances, we find the evidence of the divine origin of Christianity and the most edifying lessons of every virtue. Neither were they insensible to the benefit which would hence accrue to the cause of religion; and the contemplation of it was to their disinterested spirits a source of the purest delight. "Yea, if even I be poured out as the

libation upon my sacrifice and ministerial service [for the establishment] of your faith, I myself rejoice, and I congratulate you all." Phil. ii. 17. "I now rejoice in my sufferings for you; and I go on to endure in my flesh what yet remain of these afflictions [for the cause] of Christ, for [the good of] his body, which is the church." Col. i. 24. Thus strongly does the apostle recognize the fact, of the great advantages to be derived from his own sufferings to his fellow-christians. But how does he shrink back from putting those advantages in *the same relation* to the salvation of mankind, which belonged to the sufferings of his Lord! "Was Paul crucified for you?" 1 Cor. i. 13.

Another objection is, that the obedience and devotions of Christians are called *sacrifices*, (Rom. xii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 5. Heb. xiii. 15.) because they are acts of consecration and submission to God: and that, therefore, nothing higher may be intended in the language of the New Testament concerning the sufferings of Christ. To which we reply:

1. That the use of such terms with relation to Christ is not slight and incidental, but is amply illustrated by a copious variety of additional expressions, which place their sense out of all reasonable doubt.

2. That, in the secondary senses of words, the primary idea is often dropped, and only the accessory one remains. Obedience and prayer were the accessories of the primary notion of sacrifice: and agreeably to the usage of all language, the term itself would come to be applied, in a limited acceptation, to any act expressing devotedness to God.

3. That, in the instances adverted to, there is an allusion to the kinds of sacrifice among the Hebrews called thank-offerings, peace-offerings, and free-will-offerings.

Note XIV. page 49.

SATISFACTION. This term has been too often misconceived, and upon such misconception gross prejudices are founded against our doctrine. I beg permission, therefore, to state the sense in which it is here used, following the authority of the most accurate divines, Stapfer, Stein, Wyttenbach, Canzius, &c. By *Satisfaction*, in a theological sense, we mean, *such act or acts as shall accomplish all the moral purposes which to the infinite wisdom of God appear fit and necessary under a system of rectoral holiness, and which must otherwise have been accomplished by the exercise of retributive justice upon transgressors in their own persons.*

Sin produces a disturbance in the moral order which supreme wisdom has constituted in the universe. Such disturbance is an endeavour to cast disapprobation and contempt upon that supreme wisdom, and upon all the moral and legislative attributes of the Deity, holiness, justice, veracity, authority, and power. Were the divine government to connive at such disturbance of moral order, it would acquiesce in its own dishonour. It cannot connive at such disturbance in *any* instance, or in *any* degree, however small in the partial estimation of mortals; for great and small are relative ideas, and of the whole sum of moral relations, the Infinite Mind alone is competent to judge: and, were a single instance connived at, the *moral principle* would be violated, and the series of consequences would extend illimitably to the subversion of the whole system of moral order in the universe.—Such is the outline of an admirable train of reasoning, solely on the principles of natural ethics, by the acute and excellent Stapfer, in his *Inst. Theol.* vol. i. p. 249—258.

If, then, the work of Christ have that excellency and merit, which the unerring justice of Heaven has seen to be an actual doing of that which was requisite to compensate for the injury

perpetrated, and to restore the moral harmony which had been violated, it may with the utmost propriety, be called a *Satisfaction.* The theological use of the word was probably introduced from the Roman law. Tertullian, who was well acquainted with that science, says, "Christus peccata hominum omni satisfactionis habitu expiavit:" which may be, I conceive, justly translated, "Christ atoned for the sins of men by a satisfaction perfect in every respect." He clearly shews his understanding of the term, when he says that our Lord, by healing the wound of Malchus, repaired the injury; "sanitatis restitutione ei, quem non ipse vexaverat, satisfecit." *De Patientiâ*, cap. 3.

I would not be rude, nor on a sacred subject jocular; but *sit mihi liberum sensus animi proferre.* As empirics in medicine, contented with a few facts imperfectly understood and ill combined, deride the extensive search and the cautious inductions of the enlightened physician: and as the vulgar, looking only at appearances as they seem to them, reject and often hold in high contempt the demonstrated facts of natural philosophy; so those who disbelieve the atonement of Christ and its correlate doctrines, seem to me to form their sentiments from a very superficial consideration, hasty and incomplete views, and an unwarrantable confidence in first appearances; overlooking the great principles and general laws of a comprehensive moral system. Above all, I fear that they overlook the nature and obligations of obedience to the will of God, the rational grounds on which those obligations rest, and the true reasons of the demerit of sin. "Late philosophers," says President Edwards, "seem ready enough to own the great importance of God's maintaining steady and inviolable the laws of the natural world. It may be worthy to be considered, whether it is not of as great, or greater, importance, that the law of God, that great rule of righteousness between the supreme moral Governor and his subjects, should be maintained inviolate."—*Works*, vol. viii. p. 534.

Note XV. page 52.

CHRIST DENIED TO BE A SAVIOUR. A monitory testimony to the tendency and the actual influence of the system which denies the doctrine of atonement, occurs in the *Monthly Repository* for March, 1813, p. 182. The passage is the more observable, as the correspondence in which it occurs was communicated to the Repository avowedly to demonstrate the practical utility of the Unitarian doctrine, in the promotion of pious affections, and as a case "in which the *experience* of the writer had very satisfactorily settled the matter."

"I agree with you in what you say on the doctrine of redemption: but why do we, Unitarians, not believing in the *common* notion concerning it, call Jesus Christ 'our Saviour?' Our *teacher*, divinely inspired, he certainly was: but does not *Saviour* imply something *more?* And is not our using the term as we do, implying an acquiescence in the abominable doctrine of a sacrifice for our sins?—a doctrine the source of so much impiety in the world."

This writer deigns not to give any qualification to the naked audacity of his language, though we must *suppose* that of the *terms* at least, which he vituperates, he knew the one to be the perpetual style of the N. T. and that the other is repeatedly employed. But let us, by a large extension of candour, supply an explanation. We will grant the writer to intend that his reflections should apply only to modern ideas under the terms *Saviour* and *sacrifice*, and that the N. T. uses the former word merely to designate Jesus as our Deliverer from vice and superstition by his salutary lessons of instruction, and the latter to express only an act of exemplary obedience. Having shewn this courtesy, we affirm that the terms *Saviour*, and *sacrifice*, in the use and intention of the inspired scriptures, with regard to Christ, denoted those exalted ideas which we entertain. The truth of this position is

the point at issue, between us and our theological antagonists. Our evidences are before the world; and it is our calm and conscientious belief, that the arguings on the other side have not weakened those evidences.

The reader will be gratified by a sentiment, original, though obvious, from an author who adorns his professional eminence with the riches of elegant and sacred learning. "It was the general opinion of the Jews, about the time of the appearance of our Lord on earth, that God was about to send into the world a Prophet,* or Elijah, who should not only reform them, but, as they flattered themselves, restore the nation to its former temporal† power and glory. A similar opinion in some measure prevailed about that time in the heathen world; and it is remarkable that the ideas of the Gentiles were more correct, and more consonant to what appeared to be the designation of Providence, than those of the Jews. The latter rested chiefly on the gratification of ambition and pride, and perhaps of revenge; the former expected an amendment of the moral character. The child predicted in the Pollio of Virgil, which it was believed was to appear about that time, was not supposed to commence his reign with conquest, victory, and triumph, but with diffusing peace over the world, and improving mankind by the purity of his precepts, and the excellence of his example; by releasing men from the bondage of sin, and the dominion of those evil passions that excited them to hate and oppress, not to love and protect one another." *Dr. Falconer's Obs. on the Words of the Centurion;* Oxford, 1808, p. 16. Applying this remark to a well known passage of Cicero, I would ask whether it is credible that the writers of the N. T. would

* Matth. xi. 14. xvi. 14. Mark ix. 11, 12. Luke ix. 18. John i. 21. vi. 14.

† "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Acts i. 6.

constantly represent Jesus the crucified, by a term, which not only Jewish but Gentile usage considered as breathing the grandeur of divinity?—Verres, imitating the impious vanity of the Greek dynasties of Syria and Egypt, had caused himself to be inscribed ΣΩΤΗΡ, *Saviour*. "This epithet," exclaimed the indignant orator,—"how great! It is such that its full meaning cannot be expressed in any single word. He is a SAVIOUR, who gives salvation!" *Cicero in Verr.* II. ii. 63.

Another observation forces itself upon us in reading this correspondence, which, it should be kept in mind, is published *expressly as a pattern and display* of Unitarian piety and "experience." This is, that the basis of the whole is pure naturalism. There is no recognition of a single doctrine of revelation, except it may be reckoned such to admit that the Jews are kept a distinct people by a particular providence. Every other sentiment and expression is perfectly in the character of a Deist. Indeed, to my apprehension, the palm of *religious* superiority is due to the avowedly infidel meditations of Lords Shaftsbury and Kaimes, in the *Rhapsody* of the former, and the *Essays* of the latter *on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion.*

Note XVI. page 66.

SOCINIAN NOTION OF CHRIST'S SACRIFICE. Aided by the critical dexterity of the Polish Socinians, the author of the Notes upon the *Improved Version of the N. T.* has laboured to deduce from this verse (Heb. vii. 27.) an argument for the subversion of the whole doctrine of atonement. "*This he did*, i. e. offer up sacrifice, first, for his own sins. But Christ, in a moral sense was sinless. See ver. 26, and ch. iv. 15. His sins therefore were merely ceremonial; that is, being a descendant of the house of Judah,

ver. 14. he was, as to the priesthood, in an unconsecrated state. But in the same sense in which Christ offered up a sacrifice for his own sins, in that very sense did he offer himself a sacrifice for the sins of the people." *I. V.* p. 514. A similar gloss is given on ch. v. 3.

This great misinterpretation is excellently exposed and refuted by Dr. Owen, in his Exposition on this Epistle. To his observations I beg permission to add a few remarks, as the question is of the first importance, and as the objectionable comment is now modelled in a new form.

I. It is assumed that the *sins* mentioned by the sacred writer are, not moral offences, sins properly so called, but only ceremonial disqualifications. Such assumption, without any attempt at proof, especially in a case of so much importance, deserves to be severely reprehended. It is one of the worst artifices of argumentative injustice; and I am concerned to say that it is often employed in the Notes on the I. V. That the assumption is untenable appears to me from the following considerations.

1. As in settling the import of a term, the first attention should be paid to instances in the book itself under consideration, I must profess my conviction that of the twenty-five instances in which ἁμαρτία occurs in the Ep. to the Hebrews, not one is determined to this construction; not one could bear it without a large indulgence to hypothesis; in one example (ix. 28.) it *may* denote a sacrifice for sin; in all the others it most suitably and plainly bears its usual sense of moral crime; in those which have an affinity to the instance in question, the reference to the evil and heinousness of offence against God, is manifest and emphatic: e. g. iii. 17. iv. 15. x. 17, 18, 26.

2. Of the numerous instances of its occurrence in the N. T. not one exists in which the term can be shewn to bear this novel sense, or rather in which the contrary is not manifest. In two or three passages, it *may* signify a sacrifice for sin, ac-

cording to a well-known Hebrew metonymy: but in all the rest, it most clearly expresses moral pravity. Dr. Priestley, indeed, (on Matt. ix. 2, 6.) says: "It appears that, by the phrase, *Thy sins be forgiven thee*, Jesus at first only means, *May thy disorder be removed;* sin being considered as the cause of evil in general." *Notes on the SS.* vol. iii. p. 149. This is easily said, and it helps a weak hypothesis: but the necessary article, PROOF, is absent. The memory of Dr. Priestley, on many accounts, I highly honour; but, in questions of criticism and theology, his αὐτὸς ἔφα commands not my submission.

3. In the Septuagint and Apocrypha, and in the Hebrew O. T. I can discover no example of ἁμαρτία or חטאה being used in the acceptation assumed. It appears always to signify *moral evil*, in the abstract, the act, the actor, the penal consequence, or the expiation. Grotius, on this text, (referred to in I. V.) following Socinus and Crellius, proposes our Lord's *sufferings* as the object meant by ἁι ἴδιαι ἁμαρτίαι, and he refers for authority to Lev. xii. 8. xiv. 13. xv. 30. Let the reader judge whether these refuges do not totally fail the learned and valuable, though partial, annotator. And, on his own principles, what admirable sense does this gloss effect! *Christ endured sufferings for his own sufferings, and for the sufferings of others!* The good sense of Grotius seem to have recoiled at this consequence of his interpretation: and to help its weakness, he intimates that the passage relates to our Lord's escaping from his sufferings by accelerating his death. But, by what ingenuity this new idea can be adapted to the design of the text, the sagacious critic leaves his readers to discover. So entangled often is the finest understanding, when it labours to make the worse appear the better reason:

Delphinum silvis adpingit, fluctibus aprum.

II. This comment (both on ch. vii. 27, and v. 3.) takes for granted that the imperfection of the former priesthood must

find its *parallel* in the great High Priest of Christianity: whereas it is evident that, in this circumstance, a *contrast* is intended. The apostle shews that Christ possessed all the requisites to constitute him a real and effective High Priest; many of which were of course possessed, though in an inferior degree, by the Levitical priests: so far he continues the parallel. But when he adverts to the imperfections of the legal priests, he strenuously insists on the contrast. The circumstances parallel are,—human nature; sympathy; divine constitution; man the *terminus à quo* of the function; God, the *terminus ad quem;* the presentation of thanksgivings and expiations; and intercessory prayers for the persons on whose behalf the priest officiates with regard to God.—The contrasted circumstances are, the Divine Nature; the constitution by oath; real efficiency; the glorious excellency of the blessings bestowed; continuance to immortality; and the PERFECTION OF MORAL PURITY. Ch. i. ii. iii. 1—6. iv. 14. v. 10. vii. viii. ix. x. On the last particular, it is observable that, where the moral imperfection of the Jewish priests is introduced, particular care is taken to mark the absolute holiness of the Redeemer, by some strong declaration preceding or following. Ch. v. 3. comp. iv. 15. vii. 27. comp. 26.

III. Therefore the reason of the case, and ample proof from the connexion and the whole epistle, determine the relation of the phrase "*This* he did," to the single idea (ἀναφέρειν) of offering a sacrifice. Rosenmüller, sen. a writer not thoroughly friendly to the sentiments maintained in this discourse, clearly acknowledges the justness of our construction. After copying, (without acknowledgment, as his manner is) the unobjectionable part of Grotius's note, and citing an appropriate passage from Philo, he goes on: "It contributes to our happiness, that our High Priest had not to offer sacrifice for himself; for we learn from it, that he acted and suffered altogether on our account and for our benefit." *Scholia in N. T.* Vol. v. p. 230. See also *Peirce* on Heb. vii. 27.

Note XVII. page 67.

ETERNAL SPIRIT. That this expression, and the correspondent ones "Spirit" (in Tim. iii. 16. and 1 Pet. iii. 19.) and "Spirit of holiness" (in Rom. i. 4.) are intended to denote the DIVINE NATURE of the Messiah, is the sentiment of several good critics. Their principal argument is, that the object signified by these terms is something belonging to Christ, not extrinsically added, but essential to his person, and contradistinguished from that which, in the passages referred to, is called "the blood" and "the flesh," known Hebraisms to express human nature. The late excellent Dr. Erskine has touched on this interpretation, in passing, but with his characteristic ability, in his Sermons, vol. i. p. 373. But the reader will find the criticism examined with much sagacity, learning, and candour, in the Annotations of *Cameron* and *James Capellus; Schoetgenii Horæ Hebr.* vol. ii. in locos; *Vitringæ* (filii) *Opuscula*, Leov. 1735.

Note XVIII. page 69.

1 Tim. iii. 16. Receiving ὃς as the genuine reading, for which there is sufficient reason (V. Wetstein and Griesbach;) three constructions have been proposed.

1. That ὃς is put, by ellipsis, for αὐτὸς or ἐκεῖνος ὃς. But I am apprehensive that this construction would be foreign to the Greek idiom, both the classical and the scriptural, which would have required ὁ φανερωθεὶς ἐν σαρκὶ κ. τ. λ. Such ellipsis, though frequent in the oblique cases, is very rare *in the nominative:* and, in the few instances which, with some pains, I have been able to discover, it is used, not in the sense of *He who*, but of *whosoever*, and commonly with a generalizing particle; or else it is put partitively with μὲν and δέ. The only resemblance of exception that I can find is Rom. iii. 32. But even there, the enclitic proves that it must be taken

generally; though we are apt to overlook this, from the apostle's passing so rapidly into the particular case, which was natural to his full and ardent mind, and is one of the peculiarities of his style. Thus ὅσγε *implies* a tacit reference to a general maxim, that *Whoever* confers an immense benefit, may be presumed to be willing to do those smaller acts which are necessary to the completion of his kind intention.

If, however, this construction were grammatically unobjectionable, the very expression "He who was MANIFESTED IN THE FLESH," would ill comport with the denial of pre-existence in any other state or nature, to the being so manifested.

2. That μυστήριον is the antecedent to ὃς, as in Gal. iii. 16. and Eph. i. 13, 14. The objection to this is, that it would seem harsh and unusual to apply the word *Mystery* to Christ: but such an objection is, evidently, not of much weight. The interpretation yields a good and important sense: and we are to receive, not dictate, the phraseology of Scripture.

3. That the ὃς is to be understood as the relative of Θεὸς ζῶν, and that the intermediate words are to be read in a parenthesis. This method was proposed in a letter to the late Dr. Woide, by Vice-chancellor Cramer of Kiel. It is plain and natural as to both sense and grammatical construction, and it accords with the parenthetic style of the Apostle Paul. For these reasons, I conceive that it is entitled to be received as most probably the genuine construction. According to it, the passage runs thus:—"which is the church of the living God (the pillar and ground of the truth, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness!) who was manifested in the flesh," &c.

Note XIX. page 71.

DOCTRINE OF THE DEITY OF CHRIST. The connection between the subject of the present publication and the general

faith of Christians concerning the person of their Saviour, is obvious: but to introduce the most abridged view of our arguments for the latter doctrine was impossible in the Discourse, and would be immensely disproportioned to the form and object of these cursive notes. Yet, as any man is at liberty to give a general opinion on an extensive question, when a detail of reasons would be unseasonable, it may be permitted me to express mine, without offence or seeming dictation. Having spent a considerable portion of my time in reading, not inattentively, nor, I presume to say, with a bigotted mind, works written against this doctrine, the conviction of my mind is that their combined efforts have not disproved the body of evidence adduced in its favour by many writers since the Socinian controversy arose, two centuries ago.* Some arguments have been proved inconclusive, some alleged texts irrelevant, and some defenders of the doctrine incompetent: but the citadel is the stronger for the destruction of cumbrous outworks, wood, hay, and stubble, which never properly belonged to it.

* Owen, Hoornbeek, Turrettin, Venema, Stapfer, Bull, Waterland, Calamy, &c. The Essay *on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ*, by Dr. Van Wynpersse, translated from the Dutch by the late Rev. John Hall, of Rotterdam, (1796,) is peculiarly judicious and impressive. An excellent work, which discovers the amiable probity and fairness, no less than the learning and indefatigable research, of its lamented author, is *A Plea for the Deity of Jesus Christ, and the Doctrine of the Trinity; by the late Rev. David Simpson, M. A.* An improved edition has been published by the Rev. Edward Parsons. In a few instances, exploded readings are retained; among the many solid arguments some dubious ones occur; and sometimes other writers are quoted without due correction of their improper expressions.

Since the first publication of this treatise, the author has attempted an investigation of the subject here adverted to, upon the principle of a cautious induction, tracing the doctrine of a Messiah from its first revelation to the final descriptions of the New Testament; *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, three volumes in octavo. On this and the other important subjects connected with it, he would earnestly recommend Dr. Wardlaw's *Discourses on the Socinian Controversy*.

While the conscientious believers in the Deity of Christ are becoming more careful and exact in their statements and arguments, it is to be wished that its adversaries would, on their part also, exercise more candour and justice. I cannot but think that there are good grounds for this wish, when I find some of our theological opponents representing it as a fact unquestionable, that we hold the Divine Being to have changed himself into a babe, to have bled and died, and laid in a tomb; that our sentiment is opposed to the style of the N. T. in its usual *distinct* mention of God and the Mediator; that we deny the Unity of God; that we believe in three Supreme Beings; and that we attribute to one of them the exercise of capricious rule, malignant passions, and blind rage, and to another a character of superior mildness and benevolence. Undoubtedly, they have a fair right to say that these, or any other conclusions, *appear to them* deducible from our doctrines; but they ought not to forget our denial of such inferences, and our solemn protest against them.

Note XX. page 82.

On Archbishop Magee's Work on Atonement and Sacrifice. He who publishes on any subject which has been ably treated by another, owes to the public an exposition of his reasons: and to bring out a pamphlet, as a discussion of a topic which has well filled large volumes, appears to require some apology. The common pleas, that every man has his circle in which he may expect more attention than another, and that the same truths may usefully be treated in different ways, are not admissible in every case. I therefore, feel it incumbent on me to add this note in reference to a work deservedly held in high estimation; *Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice; by the Archbishop of Dublin.* 2 vols.

On the publication of the improved edition of Dr. Magee's

work, in 1809, I read it with much interest and general acquiescence. When my reverend brethren appointed me to preach on the Sacrifice of Christ, the recollection of that work was of course excited; and I could not but feel some anxiety lest, on the one hand, I should tread the round of apparent imitation; or, on the other, seem to affect a puerile originality, by the solicitous avoidance of sentiments already so well expressed and defended.* To escape this dilemma, the sermon was prepared and preached without once referring to Dr. Magee's book: and, when the requisition to publish obliged me to revise and transcribe it, I observed the same caution till the whole discourse, and a considerable part of these notes, were written. I then carefully perused the valuable work mentioned, with a view to ascertain the kind of comparison which I might presume my own little production would bear to it. The subject being the same, it was next to impossible that a sameness should not appear in some leading ideas: but, upon the whole, I found the points of resemblance to be few, and a considerable difference apparent in the plan, the mode of discussion, and the doctrinal deductions. The following will, I trust, be found a correct statement of the result of comparison.

1. *Coincident topics.* The antiquity and universality of SACRIFICES.—Not of human invention, but of divine institution.—Apparently unreasonable, irrespectively of the revealed import.—Figurative and symbolical.—Their actual significancy.—Designed as typical annunciations of the great object of the Messiah's mission.—His sacrifice alone possessed of intrinsic value and efficacy.—The mediatorial scheme originating in the Divine benevolence;—and agreeable to the general sense and conduct of mankind.

2. *Apparent differences.* In this Discourse, I have bound myself to a rigid strictness of method; not only with a design to render the object of the whole, and the relation of the parts,

* Vetera et scripta aliis? parata inquisitio, sed onerosa collatio. Intacta et nova? graves offensæ, levis gratia. *Plin. Ep.* v. 8.

more obvious; but with an especial wish to expose every sentiment and argument to the fullest examination. Dr. Magee's Two Discourses are composed with greater freedom in this respect: and the Seventy-six Dissertations, appended to successive parts of the text, are not arranged in the logical order of the argument, and evidently bear no relation of series to each other.

To theological sentiments, distinct from the general subject, Dr. Magee has but sparing and brief allusions: so that it would be presumptuous to form a decided opinion as to his approval of the views of Christian doctrine advanced in these pages, or his dissent from them. I fear, however, that some passages in his work indicate a material difference from those views which I think it my duty to maintain, upon the real value of the Redeemer's sacrifice,—its relation to the moral attributes and government of God,—its connection with the Divine Nature of Christ,—its efficacy,—and its application.

3. *Topics in Dr. Magee not adverted to, or but slightly, in this Discourse.* These are chiefly in the Dissertations, which extend to 825 pages, and, though perhaps too desultory, contain a treasure of information, reasoning and criticism. Many of them are upon different lights and bearings of the same subject: so that the following, though a concise, will not, I hope, be found an incomplete enumeration.—The inefficacy of repentance and human works to procure pardon.—Multiplied objects of single divine acts.—Prayer.—Divine origin of human speech.—Date of the permission to use animal food.—Disquisitions on the sacrifices of Abraham and of Job:—the command to sacrifice Isaac:—the history and criticism of the book of Job:—the diversities of the Levitical sacrifices:—the theories of sacrifice maintained by different authors.—Many valuable criticisms and comments on scripture.—Remarks on the objections, doctrines, and writings of Deists, Unitarians, Socinians, Arians, and the supporters of the schemes of Grotius, Spencer, and Warburton.

4. *Topics in this Discourse, not included in Dr. Magee's plan.* These may be generally stated as the whole of the reasonings and observations from p. 35, to the end of the Discourse.—In Notes I. and III. I had collected some of the instances which Dr. Magee had adduced; but, on comparison with his Dissertations, I have omitted them, and added a reference to his work. The passage from Cicero *(pro Fonteio,)* he mentions, but does not insert. If there be any other coincidence, it has escaped my observation.

Upon the whole, I flatter myself that, in the collation of this Discourse with the Archbishop's large and valuable work, there will be found as few resemblances as could be expected in two discussions of the same subject, and professedly drawn from the same sources of original authority.

The reader will perceive that this Note refers to the former edition of the *First* of the preceding Discourses. To the present publication it is less relevant; but I conceived myself not to be at liberty to suppress it.

Note XXI. page 210.

On the connexion of the ideas of Ransom and Atonement. In the passage here quoted, Egypt is said to become the ransom (כפר *kopher)* for the Jewish nation; as the course of calamitous events which appeared impending over the latter, was averted; and, by the remarkable providence of God, was made to fall upon the former. The same idea occurs in two passages of the Proverbs. "The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his stead." xi. 8. "The wicked is a *ransom (kopher)* for the righteous, and the transgressor instead of the upright." xxi. 18. Frequently, in the Book of Psalms, it is made an observation upon the conduct of Providence, that "the wicked fall into the pit which they have digged," that the mischievous devices which they had planned against the servants of God, are not

only frustrated, but fall back upon the heads of their authors. So Haman came to the wretched end which he had prepared for Mordecai; and the accusers of Daniel were thrown to the lions' den, out of which he had been delivered. Such instances may be deemed moral elucidations of the words (כפר *kaphar* and its cognate forms) so often occurring in the Old Testament, to denote the *pardon of sin, deliverance from its consequences*, and the *means of obtaining* those results.

The primary meaning of the verb is *to cover, to draw over;* and, in the conjugation *pihel*, it acquired the significations *to forgive*, (as it were, to *cover* an offence,) and to *do any act* which should be the *cause* or *occasion* of forgiveness; and thence, by a further process in the flow of ideas, *to compensate, to expiate, to propitiate*, and *to accept an expiation:* and these senses passed on to the cognate noun. Jacob's hope, under the alarming anticipation of meeting his brother, was, "I will *propitiate* (*akapperah*) his presence with a gift." Gen. xxxii. 21. The owner of a vicious bull, who had neglected to confine the dangerous beast, if a person was gored to death by it, forfeited his own life; but the law allowed him to redeem himself by a money payment, and this *payment* was called a (כפר) *kopher:* Ex. xxi. 31. In the same sense it occurs in Ps. xlix. 8. "By no redemption can a man redeem his brother, nor give to God a *ransom* for him." So likewise, Job xxxiii. 24. "Redeem him from going down to the grave, I have found a *ransom*."

The poll-tax of half a shekel for every Israelite, was called "the *atonement*-money," (*keseph-hakkippurim,*) and was declared to be "a heave-offering to Jehovah, to *propitiate (kapper)* for their lives." Ex. xxx. 12—16. The formula, expressing the design of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, occurs many times in the prescriptions of the law concerning sacrifices;—"The priest shall *propitiate* for him, on account of his sin; and it shall be forgiven him:" Lev. iv. v. &c. and see the Extracts from Winer, p. 244, 245, of this

volume. This is also particularly expressed in the law relating to the great annual "day of *propitiations*," (Lev. xxiii. 27, 28.) and, after several repetitions, it comes thus, as a solemn close; "He shall *propitiate* for the holy of holies; and for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, he shall *propitiate;* and for the priests, and for all the people of the assembly, he shall *propitiate:* and this shall be to you for a statute for ever, to *propitiate* for the children of Israel, on account of all their sins, once in a year." ch. xvi. 10, 17, 27, 34. Another illustrative example occurs in Deut. xxi. 8. "Accept the *expiation* for thy people Israel, O Jehovah!" In the same sense it is used, in the remarkable predictions of Ezekiel; ch. xliii. 20, 26, xlv. 17.

Among the predictions of the divine judgments upon Babylon, we find,—"Evil shall come upon thee, thou shalt not know its dawning; and destruction shall fall upon thee, thou shalt not be able to *propitiate* it." Is. xlvii. 11. In a similar sense the word occurs in Prov. xvi. 14. "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death; but a wise man will *propitiate* it."

The verb also occurs in the reflexive sense, expressing the gracious purpose of Jehovah to shew mercy to his repentant and reformed people; "He will be *propitious* to his land, his people." Deut. xxxii. 43.

In all these applications, we may trace the reigning idea of *preventing*, *averting*, or *removing* some *consequence*, which would otherwise fall upon a person or other object; and the mode of effecting the purpose is by *producing a change*, sometimes in the *agent*, sometimes in the *act*, and sometimes in the *patient;* whence arise the various forms of expression above cited.

The covering or lid of "the ark of the covenant," or, as it is in other places called, "the ark of the testimony," overlaid with gold, and upon which the cherubic figures were fixed, was called (כפרת *kapporeth*, rendered by the LXX. ἱλαστήριον·

see p. 33 of this volume:) the *propitiatory*, or *mercy-seat:* for upon it the symbolical blood of expiation was sprinkled, in the awful ceremonies of the "day of propitiations;" and from it God declared his benignity and authority to his people, his acceptance of their homage, and his will to bless them. "I will meet with thee there, and I will speak to thee, from above the *mercy-seat*, from between the two cherubims which are over the ark of the testimony, concerning all that I shall enjoin thee for the children of Israel." Ex. xxv. 22. The whole scenery of this divinely appointed symbol, so closely connected with the presentation of sacrifices under the declared intention of obtaining the pardon of sins, thus appears in concurrence with all the other cases described in the passages above quoted, clearly conveying the sentiment that a dreaded *consequence* was *averted* by a *substitution*, either of a ransom-price, or a slain sacrifice; or of one person for another by a providential interference.

Thus did the wisdom of divine institutions impearl in the hearts and the understandings of men, the great idea of SALVATION from sin and misery, through the means of a RANSOM, a SUBSTITUTION, an EXPIATION; of value equal to the greatness of the occasion, and the dignity of HIM that ordained, and of HIM that achieved it.

"He loved us, and sent his own Son, a propitiation "for our sins.—Christ,—by his own blood, hath entered "once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemp-"tion for us. For, if the blood of bulls and goats, and the "ashes of an heifer sprinkling the defiled, sanctified to the "purity of the body; HOW MUCH MORE shall the blood of "CHRIST, who, through the ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered "himself spotless to God, purify your conscience from dead "works, TO SERVE THE LIVING GOD!"

INDEX I.

HEBREW WORDS, ON WHICH SOME REMARK OR ILLUSTRATION IS OFFERED.

	PAGE.
אין לו	25
אשם	244, 254
השכיל	31
זבח שלמים	256
זמח	259
חטא	255
חטאת	244, 254
חרץ	26
כהן	84
כלה	26
כרה	21
כפר	255
—— the verb, and its derivatives	302
כפרים	130
כפרת	303
מוכיח	103
למו	264
נדבה	256
נזה	31
עלה	242
פנה	149
שוח	31
שלם תודה	256
תנופה	242
תרומה	*ib.*

INDEX II.

GREEK WORDS, ON WHICH SOME REMARK OR ILLUSTRATION IS OFFERED.

	PAGE.
Ἁγιάζειν	99, 132
ἄγκυρα	147
ἀγοράζειν	207
ἁμαρτία	292
ἀρχηγός	118
Διαθήκη	110
Ἔγγυος	102
ἐντυγχάνειν, &c.	121
ἐφάπαξ	132
Θυσιαστήριον	144
Ἱερεύς	84
ἱλαστήριον	33
Καθαρισμός	130
κεφάλαιον	93
Λύειν, λύτρον, and their compounds	204, 206
Μεσίτης	103
Ὁλόκαυστον and synonyms	243
ὁμολογία	88
Παράκλητος	121
περιποιεῖσθαι	41
πρόσφατος	153
Σφάζειν	207
Τελειωθείς	92, 118
Ὑπέρ	207
ὑπόστασις	63

INDEX III.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE, OF WHICH SOME ELUCIDATION IS ATTEMPTED.

		PAGE.
Gen. iv. 3—7.	(Abel's and Cain's sacrifice)	224
Lev. vi. xvii.	and many other passages in the ceremonial directions of the Pentateuch,	22,240,&c.302,303
Job ix. 33. ..	Daysman betwixt us	103
Ps. xl. 6—8.	Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire	21
xlv. 7. ..	O God, thy God hath anointed thee	136
cx. 4. ..	Priest for ever, after the order of Melchis.	22
cxviii. 22.	Stone, which the builders rejected	149
cxix. 118.	All, that err from thy statutes	164
Prov. xi. 8. ..	Righteous delivered, wicked in his stead	301
xxi. 18.	Wicked, a ransom for the righteous	*ib.*
xiv. 6.	Scorner seeketh wisdom, and findeth not	263
Is. viii. 14. ..	Sanctuary, and stone of stumbling	150
xliii. 3, 4.	Egypt for thy ransom,—men for thee....	210
lii. 13, to liii. 12.	(Sufferings and death of the Messiah)	28, 276
Jer.xxx.21,22.	Their Prince shall be from themselves, &c.	104
Dan.ix.24—27.	Seventy weeks, determined with regard, &c.	24
Zech. vi. 13.	He shall sit and rule,—a Priest	23, 257
ix. 11. ..	The blood of thy covenant	125
Mal. iii. 3. ...	He shall purify the sons of Levi.....	97
Matt. xxvi. 28.	Blood of the new covenant, shed for many	41
Luke xxii. 37.	The things concerning me have an end ..	271

PAGE.

Acts iii. 15.. Author of life 118
31... Prince and Saviour ..... *ib.*
xx. 28... Church, acquired by his own blood 41
Rom.i.19—22. That which may be known of God 177
ii. 14..... Gentiles, a law to themselves ..... *ib.*
iii. 25..... Whom God hath set forth, a propit.sacrif. 33
iv. 24..... Delivered up on account of our sins 125
v. 6—11. Christ,—dying for the ungodly 216
2 Cor. v. 21. One died for all, then did the all die 42
Gal. iii. 20... A Mediator is not of one 107
Phil. ii. 17.. If I be poured out as a libation 285
Col. i. 24. .. Rejoice in my sufferings for you 286
ii. 13—15. Blotting out the hand-writing 215
1 Tim. iii. 16. Great, the mystery of godliness 68, 295
Heb. i. 3..... Express Image of his manner of existence 63
ii. 10... Author of salvation 118
11.. He who sanctifieth, and they who are sanctif. 99
14.. Who hath the power of death 214
17... Merciful and faithful High Priest 88
iii. 1. .. High Priest of our confession ..... *ib.*
Messenger 97
iv. 14... Great H. Priest, passed into the heavens 88, 127
15.. Sympathize with our weaknesses 89, 152
v. 1... High Priest, on the behalf of men 87
5.. Assumed not this honour to himself .. 90, 127
6... Order of Melchisedec ..... *ib.*
7—10. (Christ's sufferings & learning obedience) 91
vi. 6. Crucify the Son of God afresh 128
19. Refuge,—hope,—anchor 146, 148
20. Forerunner, for us entered 123
vii. 22. Surety of a better covenant 102
24. Continuing ever, unchangeable priesthood 131
26. Such a High Priest became us 93, 131
27. This he did, offering up himself 291
28. The Son, made perfect for ever 128

PAGE.
Heb. viii. 2. Minister of the sanctuary 97
4. If on earth, he would not be a priest 87
6. Mediator of a better covenant 102
ix. 11. High Priest of future blessings 96
12. Expia.of transgressions under the first cov. 206
14. Through the Eternal Spirit 67, 295
15—23. (Validity of the new covenant by a sacrif.) 110
23, 24. Heavenly things purified by sacrifices .. 155
25—28. Put away sin by the sacrifice of himself 132
x. 10. Offering—of Jesus Christ, once ..... *ib.*
19—22. Adm.into the holiest,by the blood of Jesus 153
21. A great Priest over the house of God .. 87
29. Trampled upon the Son of God 128
xi. 4. By faith, Abel offered 224, 226
Author and Perfecter of faith 118
xii. 2. The joy set before him 135
24. Mediator of the new covenant 116
25. Who now delivereth the divine oracles .. 98
xiii. 10. We have an altar 144
11. Jesus,—suffered without the gate 145
20, 21. The blood of the everlasting covenant .. 124
1 John ii. 1... Advocate with the Father 122

INDEX IV.

PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS AND ALLUSIONS.

ABEL, cry of his blood, 117. His sacrifice, 224.

Abrabenel, Rabbi, on the design of sacrifice, 13.

Access to God, an effect of the sacrifice of Christ, 146, 153.

Accommodation System, in Biblical Interpretation, 165.

Alscheth, Rabbi, applies Isaiah liii. to the Messiah, 27.

Anchor, its emblematical meaning, 147.

Anger of God, 140—143.

Antinomian notions upon the Moral Law, 181.

Aristotle's description of a priest, 87.

Arminian hypothesis, with respect to the Moral Law, 181.

Atonement, doctrine of, 136. Latent causes of disaffection to it, 81. Propriety of describing it by the analogy of pecuniary obligations, 126. A symbolical atonement, the design of the Levitical sacrifices, 243. Atonement-money, 303. Great annual day of atonement, 246.

Azazel, on the meaning of the term, 247, 249.

CAUSATION, the philosophy of, favourable to the doctrines of redemption, 282.

Changeableness in the Deity, not implied in the doctrine of the atonement, 143.

CHRIST, OUR LORD JESUS; his qualifications for the work of expiation, 56, 60, 62, 65. His suretyship and mediation, 102. His sufferings, 44. the antecedent and cause of salvation, 77, 284. His assumption of the human nature, 100. His learning obedience by suffering, 91. His exaltation and reward, 93, 95, 135. His presiding over the universal worship of the church, 98. His intercession, 61, 133. Relation of his Divine Nature to the value of his atonement, 69—71. Hints upon his Deity, 64, 67, 99, 101, 129, 134, 296. See *Priesthood* and *Sacrifice*.

Chrysostom, on Christ as the author of life, 119.

Cocceius on the term *Priest*, 85.
Confession of sins, the accompaniment of a sacrifice, 14, 246.
Corner-stone, its symbolical meaning, 148.
Cramer, Prof. on the construction of 1 Tim. iii. 16.

Dahler, Dr. of Strasburg, on Jer. xxx. 21, 22, 106.
Decalogue, the true idea of, 177.
Delany, Dr. Patrick, on sacrifice, 222, 228, 233.
De Wette on Trespass and Sin-offerings, 253. His awful perversions of Christian doctrine, 272.
Displeasure of God against sin, necessary to be manifested, 52.
Druidical notions of sacrifice, 218, 235, 255.

Edwards, Presid. on the importance of maintaining the moral laws of the universe, 288.
Egyptian notions of sacrifice, 253.
Election, doctrine of, 77.
Ernesti, J. A. on Heb. ix. 12, 206.
Erskine, Dr. on the Sinai Covenant, 103.
Ewing, Rev. Greville, on Heb. ix. 16, 112.
Expediency, not the true foundation of a moral system, 131.
Expiation, nature of, 136, 137.

Falconer, William, M. D. on the words of the centurion at the cross, 290.

Gesenius, Prof. on the term *Priest*, 85. His arguments against applying the liiid. chapter of Isaiah to the Messiah, 261—270. His version of that portion of scripture, 276—281. His collusive mode of admitting prophecies of the Messiah, 271. His *Lexicon*, ix. 85.
Gospel, invitations of, founded upon the atoning sacrifice of Christ, 74, 80.
Government, supreme moral; its nature and necessity, 175.

Grace of God, not excited by the atonement of Christ, 138, 140.
Grotius, on heathen notions of sacrifice, 236. His interpretation of Heb. vii. 27, 293.
Guilt, in what sense imputed to Christ, 284.

Happiness, its nature and originating principle, 185.
Hallett, on Heb. xi. 4, 227.
Heaven secured from dishonour by the sacrifice of Christ, 154.
Hebrews, the Epistle to the; its divine authority, 159.
Holiness, defined, 183. The holiness of God, 35.
Hooker's eulogy of *Law*, 182.
Hume, on causation, 282.
Hyrcanus, John, 104.

Influence of the Holy Spirit, 78.
———— moral, of the doctrines of grace and redemption, 82.

Jenyns, Soame, on the luminous evidence of the Scriptures to the doctrine of the Atonement, 43.
Jerome on Abel's sacrifice, 227.
Josephus on the annual day of expiation, 247. On trespass-offerings, 253.
Justice, the sole demand of the moral law, 178. Retributive, 192. Remunerative, 193. Punitive, 194—197. The justice of God, 36, 51.

Kimchi, on the term *Priest*, 84.

Law, its general nature, 139, 182. Moral, 176, 189. That of God, not founded on mere will, 179; but on the basis of supreme and unalterable reason, 180. Cannot admit of relaxation, 199. Its relation to the Atonement, 139.
Le Clerc on Abel's sacrifice, 227.
Levites, their office and functions, 19, 238.

Livy, passages from, illustrating the heathen opinions on sacrifice, 235.
Love of God, free and sovereign, the primary cause of salvation, 141.

Maclaurin, John; his writings recommended, 54.
Magee, Archbishop; his work on *Atonement and Sacrifice*, 299.
Mankind, depraved and guilty state of, 197.
Mediator, the idea of, 106, 116.
Mercy of God, 39.
Michaelis, Sir John David, on Heb. i. 3, 63. On Heb. v. 7—10, 90. On sitting at the right hand, 94. On the Divine Nature of Christ, 99. On the term *sanctifying*, 100. On Heb. ix. 15—23, 113. On the *blood of sprinkling*, 117. On the *blood of the covenant*, 125. On the *corner-stone*, at the building of the temple, 149. On Psalm cxix. 118, 164. On Abel's sacrifice, 227. On the origin of sacrifices, 232. On the order of the Levites, 238. On Prov. xiv. 6, 263. His interpretation of Is. liii. 10, 274. His version of that whole section of prophecy, 276—280.
Mitford, the historian of Greece, on the origin of sacrifices, 229.

Neologists of Germany; on their false and dangerous modes of interpreting the Scriptures, 163, 260, 263, 267, 269, 272.

Obligation to moral obedience, its reason and measure.
Pardon of sin, the bestowment of grace and righteousness, 73. It belongs to the province of the Divine Government, 139, 141. Its moral reason, 141.
Paul, the apostle; observations on his not citing Is. liii., 28.
Philo, on sacrifices, 243. On the High Priest's entering the most holy place, 248. On the trespass-offerings, 253.

Priest; meaning of the term, 18, 83—87. Nature and origin of the office, 18.

Priesthood, Levitical; its character and intention, 19. Its office and duty, 233.

———— of CHRIST; its character, real and efficient, 96. Not figurative, 161. Sole and unique, 130. Perfect, 131. Contrasted with the Levitical priesthood, 133, 294. Summary of its characteristic and pre-eminent properties, 156, 158.

Priestley, Dr. his opinion upon the design of sacrifices, 6. Verbally allows the atonement of Christ, 89. On his interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 220. On Matt. ix. 2, 6, 293.

Propitiation, 137. Effected by Christ, 72.

Pseudo-Calvinistic notion with regard to the Moral Law, 182.

Punishment of sin, its nature, 140. Its necessity, 188. Sustained by Jesus Christ, 39.

Pythagoræans, their doctrine concerning sacrifice, 237.

RANDOLPH, Dr. Thomas, on Ps. xl. 21.

Ransom and Atonement, connexion of the ideas, 209—214, 301.

Reconciliation, effected by the sacrifice of Christ, 50, 136, 144.

Redemption, general or particular, 75. The cause of holiness and good works, not their effect, 77. Origin and theological use of the term, 203, 208.

Right of believers to divine blessings, whence it is derived, 144.

Righteousness of God, essential and necessary, 140.

Rosenmüller, sen. on Heb. i. 3, 63. On vii. 27, 294.

————, jun. on Abel's sacrifice, 227. His version of Is. liii. 277—281.

Ryland, Dr. referred to on Jer. xxx. 21, 22, 106.

SACRIFICE; defined, 3. Antiquity and extent of the practice, *ib.* Origin of, 10. 221—234. Heathen notions of, 12, 234, 255. Jewish notions of, 13. That the ancient sacrifices had no moral efficiency, 22, 133. That they were symbolical of the Messiah, as a victim to be immolated for mankind, 8, 9, 13, 15, 20. Heathen practice of human sacrifices, 220. Levitical sacrifices, their various kinds, and the rites used in each, 239—256. Design of, 2, 16, 243, 250, 254. Swept away by the hand of providence, 35.

——— of our Lord Jesus Christ; not so denominated in accommodation to Jewish predilections, 5, 32, 161. A real substitution, 40, 53, 58. Completed by his death 131. Its efficacy, 71, 135. Its practical references, 49.

Sacrifices; obedience of the faithful, why so called, 286.

Sacy, le Maistre de; excellence of his translation of the Bible, 274.

Sanctification, a fruit of the sacrifice of Christ, 145.

Satisfaction, 287. Effected by the sufferings and death of Christ, 54.

SAVIOUR, implications and importance of the epithet; yet objected to by an anonymous Unitarian, 289.

Schleusner, on Heb. i. 3, 63.

Schultens on the term *Priest*, 85.

Seiler, Dr. Geo. Fred. on Jer. xxx. 21, 22, 106. On the mischiefs of spurious criticism, 269. His high character as a Biblical interpreter, 275. His version of Is. liii. 276—280.

Septuagint; its faulty character in relation to the translation of the prophets, 27, 104.

Simpson, Rev. David, *on the Deity of Christ*, recommended, 297.

Sin, defined, 183. Its unspeakable evil, 15, 36, 50, 184, 190. Its necessary effects, 186, 188, 192.

Socinian hypothesis, with respect to the moral law, 181. Views of the sacrifice of Christ, 220, 291.

Stapfer, John Fred. Prof. (of Berne, who died in 1775,) on the idea of Satisfaction, 287.
Stewart, Prof. Dugald; on Causation, 283.
Stonard, Dr. on a prophecy of Daniel, 25. On the *Vision of Zechariah*, 259.
Stuart, American Prof. his valuable writings, ix. 240.
Substitution of Christ for mankind, 40, 53, 58.
Sufferings of Christ; their peculiar character, 44, 66. Their awfulness and intensity, 45—47. Incapable of being rationally accounted for, if their expiatory design be rejected, 48.

Targum of Jonathan, on Is. liii. 27.
Tertullian on satisfaction as effected by Christ, 288.
Threatening from God, what, 141.
Tittmann, Dr. Charles Chr. on Ps. xl. 6, 21. On the character and tendency of the modern innovations on theology in Germany, 165. His character and works, 173.
Translations, utility of comparing, 273.

Unchangeableness of God, not violated by the doctrine of Atonement, 138, 142.
Union of Christ with his people, 57, 73, 136, 144.

Van Ess, Dr. Leander; his ability and felicity as a Bible translator, 63.
Van Wynpersse, Dr. on *the Divinity of Christ*, recommended, 297.

Wardlaw's, Dr. *Discourses on the Socinian Controversy*, recommended, 297.
Weigand, on Gal. iii. 20, 109.
Winer's (Dr. G. B.) account of the classes and modes of the Levitical sacrifices, 239—256.
Wisdom of God, in the constitution of redemption, 38.
Wolzogenius on Is. liii. 4, 264.

BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY B. J. HOLDSWORTH,

18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, LONDON.

THE FIFTH EDITION, REVISED AND IMPROVED, with a new and copious Index, of

CALMET'S DICTIONARY of the HOLY BIBLE, with the Fragments, a series of valuable Dissertations, containing entirely new Illustrations of Scripture Incidents and Expressions, selected from the most Authentic Historians, Travellers, &c. illustrated by *several hundred* Plates.

In the FIFTH EDITION, to which the attention of the public is now respectfully solicited, every effort has been made to secure the accuracy and extend the usefulness of the work. The references and quotations, amounting to MANY thousands, have been verified and corrected—the explanations of the plates, hitherto detached from the body of the work, to the great inconvenience of the reader, have been INCORPORATED with the articles of which they form an integral part—the whole of the text has passed under a diligent revision—and several entirely NEW Articles, as well as occasional additions, have been introduced. To the whole will be added, a new and copious Index, embracing every subject treated of in the work, as well as the several texts of Scripture illustrated and explained.

CHARACTER OF THIS WORK.

"It is certainly one without which no library can be complete, and with which few other books, explanatory of Scripture, can be required. To the Orientalist, to the Biblical scholar, to the general reader, and, more especially, to the Minister of the Gospel, it presents an inexhaustible fund of instruction, while to all it supplies amusement of the most elevated kind"—*New Monthly Magazine.*

"Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible is, in itself, a work which no Biblical Scholar would like to be without; but its mere republication would have been extremely unacceptable. The work in its present form is an invaluable treasury of Biblical lore, and a stupendous monument of literary industry."—*Eclectic Review.*

Dr. MANT has made great use of Calmet in the Notes to his Bible, published by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge; and in his list of books to which he acknowledges obligations, particularly specifies the "FRAGMENTS" annexed to this Edition of Calmet.

"A translation of this truly valuable Work, with occasional remarks, was published in 1742, in three folio volumes; which having become extremely scarce, an edition was published in 1801, in two thick quarto volumes, by Mr. Taylor, with a volume of Additions from books of voyages and travels, &c. under the title of "FRAGMENTS." A new edition, enlarged and greatly improved, is now publishing. The work is pleasingly illustrated with numerous engravings, which convey an accurate idea of Oriental manners and customs. CALMET'S DICTIONARY IS THE BASIS OF ALL SIMILAR MODERN WORKS OF THE LIKE KIND."—*Horne's Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.* Vol. 2. p. 746. Fifth Edition.

See also *Monthly Review, Monthly Magazine, etc.*

Books published by B. J. Holdsworth, St. Paul's Church Yard.

1. SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY to the MESSIAH; an Inquiry with a View to a Satisfactory Determination of the Doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures concerning the Person of Christ. By J. P. SMITH, D. D. 3 vols. 8vo. Price 1l. 14s.

"Unquestionably the most elaborate defence and proof of the deity of Jesus Christ extant in our language."—Horne's Introduction to the Study of the Bible, vol. ii. appen. page 115.

Such of Dr. Smith's other works as are in print may be had of B. J. H.

Dedicated to the Bishop of Chester.

2. The WHOLE WORKS of EDWARD REYNOLDS, D. D. Lord Bishop of Norwich. Now first collected. With a Life of the Author, by ALEXANDER CHALMERS, Esq. and finely engraved Portrait, 6 vols. 8vo. 3l.

"It is now our pleasing duty to congratulate the public upon a Complete Collection of the Writings of one of the most eminent among the Divines of the seventeenth century. The present edition of the Works of Bishop Reynolds forms a most valuable accession to our stores of sound and masculine theology. It is but just to add, that though carefully and handsomely printed, its price is extremely moderate."—*Christian Remembrancer*, No. 1826.

3. HISTORY of the TRANSMISSION of ANCIENT BOOKS to Modern Times; or a Concise Account of the Means by which the Genuineness and Authenticity of Ancient Historical Works are ascertained. By ISAAC TAYLOR, jun. 8vo. price 8s.

"Mr. Taylor is deserving of much praise for the publication of this volume: his design is comprehensive; his arrangement clear; and his treatment of the several topics that engage him, at once concise and satisfactory."—Monthly Rev. Sept. 1827.

4. The PROCESS of HISTORICAL PROOF explained and exemplified; to which are subjoined Observations on the peculiar Points of the Christian Evidence. By ISAAC TAYLOR, Jun. Author of "Elements of Thought." 8vo. Price 9s.

5. ELEMENTS of THOUGHT, or, First Lessons in the Knowledge of the Mind. By ISAAC TAYLOR, Jun. 12mo. Second edition, revised and enlarged, 4*s*. 6*d*.

"Considering how necessary it is towards right thinking, to acquire habits of correct expression, we very strongly recommend this; as an elementary work, it is truly valuable, and the variety of information it contains, ought not to be deemed less valuable on account of its unassuming title."—Monthly Review.

6. CABINET LIBRARY of DIVINITY. By the Rev. Dr. WILSON, consisting of Selections from the Works of Leighton, Owen, Hopkins, and Howe. 6 vols. 18mo. Price 18s.

7. SERMONS, Doctrinal and Practical, elucidating the Duty of Studying Prophecy, the Intermediate State, the Knowledge of each other in the Life to Come, the Millenial Reign of Christ upon Earth, &c. &c. By the Rev. JOHN NOBLE COLEMAN, M. A. late of Queen's College, Oxford. 8vo. Price 12s.

8. ELEMENTS of MENTAL and MORAL SCIENCE. By the Rev. G PAYNE, M.A. Price 12s.

9. ELEMENTS of BIBLICAL CRITICISM and INTERPRETATION, with special reference to the New Testament. Translated from the Latin of Ernesti, &c.; and accompanied with Notes. By MOSES STUART, of Andover, America. Re-published, with additional observations. By E. HENDERSON, Author of "Biblical Researches," &c. 12mo. Price 4s.

10. ESSAYS, in a Series of Letters, on DECISION of CHARACTER, &c. By JOHN FOSTER. A new edition, being the Eighth. 8vo. Price 10*s*.

The Rev. T. F. Dibdin, in page 87 of his "Library Companion," has the following observation:—"Mr. Foster's Essays are full of ingenuity and original remark. The style of them is at once terse and elegant."

11. An ESSAY on the EVILS of POPULAR IGNORANCE. By JOHN FOSTER, author of "Essays on Decision of Character," &c. 8vo. Second edition, price 12*s*.

12. The LIFE and OPINIONS of JOHN DE WYCLIFFE, D.D. illustrated principally from his unpublished Manuscripts, with a Preliminary View of the Papal System, and of the State of the Protestant Doctrine in Europe to the commencement of the Fourteenth Century. By ROBERT VAUGHAN. With a finely engraved Portrait by E. H. Finden. 2 vols. 8vo. price 21s. nearly ready.

This Work has been composed after a careful examination of the numerous Wycliffe manuscripts in the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, in the British Museum, Lambeth Palace, and Trinity College, Dublin. It is designed to present a complete view of the life and times of our patriarch reformer; and will include analytical notices of nearly the whole of his writings.

13. MORELL'S, (Rev. T. Author of "Studies in History") ELEMENTS of the HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY and SCIENCE, from the earliest Authentic Records to the Commencement of the Eighteenth Century. 1 vol. 8vo. 12s.

"This book contains a great fund of information in a condensed and judicious form. It combines an abridged view of the History of Philosophy, as useful for the general student as the larger work of Brucher, and at the same time the general progress of knowledge and science on other subjects." Monthly Repository, Oct. 1827.

14. The BLASPHEMY AGAINST the HOLY SPIRIT, and the Doctrine of Spiritual Influence, considered in several Discourses, with Notes and Illustrations. By W. ORME, 12mo. Price 5s.

15. MEMOIRS, including Correspondence and other Remains of Mr. JOHN URQUHART, late of the University of St. Andrews. By the Rev. W. ORME. 2 vols. 12mo. Price 10s. boards, with a Portrait, and Prefatory Letter of Dr. CHALMERS.

16. DEVOTIONAL VERSES, by BERNARD BARTON. 12mo. Price 6s. 6d.

"Mr. Barton's style is well suited to devotional poetry. It has great sweetness and pathos, accompanied with no inconsiderable degree of power, which well qualify it for the expression of the higher and purer feelings of the heart." —New Monthly Magazine, March, 1826.

17. THE WIDOW'S TALE, and other POEMS. By BERNARD BARTON, Author of "Devotional Verses." 12mo. 5s. 6d.

"This interesting little Volume contains some of the sweetest poetry Mr. Barton has ever written." Literary Magnet, April, 1827.

18. THE EARLY LIFE of CHRIST, an Example to the Young. By the Rev. HENRY MARCH. Author of Sabbaths at Home. 12mo. 4s. boards.

19. REVIEWS; by the Rev. ROBERT HALL, A.M. Now first collected in one vol. 8vo. price 5s. Third edition.

20. The CHURCH in CANAAN; or, Heirs in Possession receiving the Promises. In which is displayed the Faithfulness of God and the Felicity of his People. By the Rev. W. SEATON, Curate of St. Thomas's Church, Salisbury. 12mo. price 6s.

21. SKETCHES of (400) SERMONS, on some of the most interesting Passages of Holy Writ; preached to Congregations of the United Kingdom, and on the European Continent. *Furnished by their respective Authors.* 8 vols. 12mo. Third Edition. With an index of texts, &c. price £1. 12s. or any volume separate, price 4s.

The occasional introduction of Sermons suited to the seasons, and important providential events, will not, it is hoped, be unacceptable to those for whom this publication is principally designed.

22. SCHLEUSNER'S NEW TESTAMENT LEXICON, compressed into the form of a Manual; comprising the whole of his explanations and Scripture References, and retaining every thing necessary for the usual purposes of consulting, as well as for academic instruction. By J. CAREY, LL.D. Editor of Ainsworth's Dictionary, &c. 8vo. price 14s.

*** The above (Carey's Schleusner) contains nearly all that is in the Original Work published at 3*l.* with the exception of the references to the Bible not being in full.

23. The LIFE of the Rev. PHILIP HENRY, A.M. By the Rev. MATTHEW HENRY, V. D. M. Enlarged with important additions, Notes, &c. by J. B. WILLIAMS, F. A. S. 1 vol. 8vo. price 15s. with Portraits.

24. ORIENTAL OBSERVATIONS, AND OCCASIONAL CRITICISMS, illustrating several hundred passages of Scripture. By JOHN CALLOWAY, late Missionary in Ceylon. 12mo. price 2s. 6d.

25. ON IDOLATRY, A POEM by the Rev. WILLIAM SWAN, Missionary, and Author of the Memoirs of Mrs PATERSON, with a Preface by the Rev. GREVILLE EWING, 12mo. price 5s. 6d.

"There is an ease, a freedom from mannerism, a refreshing simplicity in the versification, which remind us of Dryden, Churchill, and Cowper, rather than of the style of modern poets."—Eclectic, May, 1827.

26. A COURSE OF LECTURES on the EVIDENCES OF REVELATION, delivered at the MONTHLY MEETINGS of the London Congregational Union.—By the Rev. W. Orme, Dr. Collyer, Rev. H. F. Burder, Stratten, Walford, Dr. J. Pye Smith, Rev. A. Reed, Curwen, Philip, Dr. Winter, Rev. J. Morison, and the Rev. Joseph Fletcher, A.M. 1 vol. 8vo. Price 10s. 6d.

PRINTED BY S. HOLDSWORTH, 13, PATERNOSTER ROW.

Smith, John Pye 191276 234.3 Sm61
Four discourses on the sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ

234.3
191276 Sm61

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary
175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others.
You are responsible for them.